The Tamiliau Archæological Society Series. No. I.

THE

Tamilian Antiquary.

CONTENTS.

I. The Bharata Land or "Dravidian India." ... 1
By Pandit D. Savariroyan, M.R.A.S.

II. The Solar and the Lunar Races of Iudia ... 27
By V. J. Tamby Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.

III. Ode to Cheraman Perum Chorru Udiyan Cheralathan 46
By K. G. Sesha Aiyar Esq., B.A., B.L.

IV. (1)otes on the Relation of Pandavas to the Tamilian Kings 48
By Pandit D. Savariroyan M.R.A.S.

(2) On the words "Chera" and "Kerala" ... 62
By Pandit D. Savariroyan, M.R.A.S.

SECOND EDITION.

PUBLISHED BY

PANDIT D. SAVARIROYAN.

Hony. Secretary. T. A. Society. Trichinopoly.

1913.

All rights reserved.] *[Price As. 8.*

THE

TAMILIAN ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Established January 1903.

The object of the Tamilian Archæological Society are:—(1) to help towards a systematic, scientific and critical study of the classical works of Southern India; (2) to carry on researches in the field of South Indian Philology, Archæology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, etc. and (3) to draw materials for the construction of an accurate History of the peoples of South India, (including Ceylon) and their languages, literature and philosophy.

T. A. Society's "Series" contain productions of original works, criticisms and reprints on subjects included within the objects of the Society and they are distributed free to the members. A member admitted in any part of the year will receive the publications for that year and BACK NUMBERS, at half the price, on application to the Secretary.

Membership of the T. A. Society can be secured by payment of an Entrance fee of Rs. 2/8 and of an annual Subscription of Rs. 2/8 payable before 31st March of each year. Life-membership is Rs. 25/- only. Application for membership should be made to the Secretary supported by at least two members; and they will be enrolled as members as soon as they pay their entrance fee and first subscription.

Full particulars of the Society can be had by applying to Paṇḍit **D. Savariroyan, M.R.A.S.,** *Hony. Secretary, Trichinopoly, or* **M. Jivaratnam Esq., B.A.,** *Madras, Joint Secretary, or to* **V. J. Tamby Pillai Esq., M.R.A.S.,** *Audit Office, Colombo, or* **P. K. Aiyasamy Pillai Esq., B.A., B.L.,** *Palamcottah, Local Secretaries.*

THE

Tamilian Antiquary.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

I. The Bharata Land or "Dravidian India." ... 1
By Pandit D. Savariroyan, M. R. A. S.

II. The Solar and the Lunar Races of India ... 27
By V. J. Tamby Pillai Esq., M. R. A. S.

III. Ode to Cheraman Perum Chorru Udiyan Cheralathan 46
By K. G. Sesha Aiyar Esq., B. A., B. L.

IV. (1) Notes on the Relation of Pandavas to the Tamilian Kings 48
By Pandit D. Savariroyan M. R. A. S.

(2) On the words "Chera" and "Kerala" ... 62
By Pandit D. Savariroyan, M. R. A. S.

SECOND EDITION.

PUBLISHED BY

PANDIT D. SAVARIROYAN,

Hony. Secretary, T. A. Society, Trichinopoly.

MADRAS:

AT THE MEYKANDAN PRESS.

1913.

All rights reserved.]

[Price As. 8.

THE BHARATA LAND

OR

"DRAVIDIAN INDIA"

By Paṇḍit D. Savariroyan M. R. A. S.

PART I.—The Tamilians.

I. THEIR MIGRATION AND ORIGINAL HOME.

The pre-Āryan conquerors of India, who were known as the *Bharatas* and from whom the country received its name (Bharata Bhūmi), were the most powerful and populous nation in ancient India. They formed a branch of the extinct Chaldaic-Elamite race and migrated in very early times into India, in successive batches, from Acadian-Chaldea, the earliest seat of ancient civilisation. Their first exit from Chaldea dates from the time of Manu and the legend of the Indian *Deluge*. One clan led by Manu passed through the Persian Gulf, crossed the Arabian Sea, and landed on the south-west coast of India. It first occupied *Malaya*, "the mount," in the Western Ghats, not far distant from the modern Cape Comorin, and colonised the southern continent known as *Paṇḍu* (பண்டு); hence the names *Pāṇḍiyas* to the to the kings of the south and *Pāṇḍavas* to the heroes of the Mahābhārata.

The Paṇḍu land extended of yore farther to the south than at the present day. A greater portion of the land, it is said, has since been claimed by the ocean. This tradition recorded in the ancient Tamiḷ classics has been confirmed by the researches of geologists and naturalists.* It speaks of

---

* Prof. Hæckel says—"The Indian Ocean formed a continent which extended from Sunda Islands along the coast of Asia to the

a large continent which once existed contiguous to Southern India and which was submerged by the ocean, during a certain inundation, at a time not far removed from human collection. According to this the submerged land was bounded by the river *Paḥṟuḷi* (பஃறுளி) and the mount *Kumari* (குமரி) and consisted of forty-nine districts to the south of the present Cape Comorin, covering an area of 700 *yōjanas*. It was thickly inhabited, was the seat of learning and culture and the centre of the ancient civilisation of the antediluvian Tamiḻian race that settled and occupied the whole southern continet of which India formed a part. It is noteworthy that centuries before the birth of the sciences of Geology and Natural History these facts have been recorded and preserved in a more or less accurate form in ancient Tamiḻ classical works. The author of *Silappadikāram*, "the Epic of the Anklet," who belonged to the second Century A.D., ‡ refers to this tradition in Canto xi, lines 19-20, which runs thus:

> "பஃறுளியாற்றுடன் பன்மலையடுக்கத்துக்
> குமரிக்கோடுகொடுங்கடல் கொள்ள,"

i. e., "the piece of land originally situated between the river *Paḥṟuḷi* and mount *Kumari* was swallowed up by the ocean." Nakkīrar, a famous poet and commentator of the third Tamiḻ Academy, has also recorded this fact in his introduction to the *Iṟaiyanār's Agapporuḷ*. Mention is as well made of this tradition by *Iḷampūraṇar* in his preface to *Tolkāppiyam* and by *Nachchinārkiniyar* in his commentary to the same.

---

east coast of Africa. This large continent is of great importance from being the probable cradle of the human race." And in the 'Science of Man'—Australia, (December, 1900), we thus read. "The locality of the origin of the earliest race from recent researches appears to have been on lands now submerged beneath the Indian Ocean."

‡ See the learned article on *The Augustan Age of Tamil Literature*, by Mr. S. Kṛishṇasvāmi Aiyaṅgār, M.A., in the *Madras Review*, vol. x. No. 36 (February 1904), pp. 30-56.

Before this diluvial catastrophe, the Western Ghats were known as the *Northern Mountains*, in relation to the southern land which was submerged by the ocean. The *Saṭapāta Brāhmaṇa* relates that the ark of Manu rested in the *Northern Mountains* and the *Purāṇas* mention that he, the "Lord of the Drāviḍa," * underwent austere penance in the Malaya. The *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* give an account of seven other *Ṛishis* who accompanied Manu and settled in the new colony. This indicates the advent of other clans headed by other *Ṛishis* who followed the footsteps of the "Lord of the Drāviḍa." Thus it appears that the Tamiḻian race that settled in the *Paṇḍu* land belonged to these eight *Ṛishis* or *Prajāpatis*, one of whom was the famous *Ṛishi* Pulastya of the extreme South, from whom were descended Agastya, the *Tamiḻ Muni*, and Rāvaṇa, the king of the *South*.

The *Saṭapāta Brāhmaṇa*, in which the story of Manu first occurs, does not mention the name of the *Northern Mountains*. However, there is ample evidence in the *purāṇic* accounts to identify the "*Northern Mountains*" with the Western Ghats, and the particular spot on which the ark rested with *Malaya*. The *Matsya-purāṇa* says that Manu, "the son of the Sun," underwent severe penance in Malaya and the "Divine Fish" appeared to him in the river *Kritamālā* or the Vaigai † on whose banks Madura, the capital of the Pāṇḍiyan kings, was built. That the "Lord of the Drāviḍa" offered sacrifices on the river Kritamālā is also

---

* Manu is spoken of in the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa* as the "Lord of the Drāviḍa."

† In *Vishṇu Purāṇa*, in the chapter in which *Kaliyuga Dharma* is treated, the Ṛishi Parāšara says: "There will in future arise great saints in the Tamiḻ land on the banks of the rivers, *viz.*, the Tāmraparṇi, the Kritamālā, the Chirini, the Kāvēri and the Pretichini." The Vaishṇava Saints who were respectively born on the banks of these rivers are; Nammāḻvār (on the Tāmraparṇi or Porunai), Periyāḻvār (on the Kritamālā or Vaigai), Tirumaṅgaiyāḻvār (on the Chirini or

mentioned in the *Bhāgavata-Purāṇa*. The *Agni-Purāṇa* supports the fact that Manu performed his penance on the banks of the Kritamālā. The Vana-Parva of the *Mahābhārata* relates the fact a little differently and says that Manu performed his penance on the banks of the river *Chīrini* or *Pālāṟu* (பாலாறு), once the northern boundary of the Pāṇḍiyan Kingdom. Accordingly to its version Manu reached, many years hence, with seven other *Ṛishis* the summit of the Himālayas.

All the ancient records thus unanimously agree in regarding the scene of action of Manu as the land of the Tamiḷs. The story in the *Mahābhārata* that Manu went from the South to the North, *i.e.*, from the Malaya to the Himālayas is not of much value, for it is unsupported by any of the ancient *Purāṇas*. It is clear that the writer of the passage in the *Mahābhārata* mistook the *Northern Mountains* of the *Saṭapāta Brāhmaṇa* for the Himālayas, and erroneously connected Manu's *descent* on the Malaya with the Himālaya mountains. This unconnected mention of Manu and the Himālayas is inexplicable except by concluding that this is a non-Āryan myth which has been borrowed from other sources by the *Saṭapāta Brāhmaṇa* and repeated in subsequent works as the *Mahābhārata*, etc. "The story has no roots in Āryan myth in which it stands alone, unconnected with any of its legends, being evidently torn out of its own native cycle of the Izdubar poems.*

Pālāṟu), Toṇḍar-aḍi-poḍigaḷ and Tiruppāṇāḷvār (on the Kāvēri or Ponni), and Kulaśēkharāḷvār (on the Pretīchini—a river falling in the Arabian Sea near Calicut).

We also make mention of the Kritamālā from one of the Śaivite Purāṇas. In the XII chapter of the *Ālasya Māhātmya*, a portion of the *Skānda-Purāṇa* where Sūta-Muni addressing other Ṛishis says as follows; "I have described to you the origin of the river *Vaigai*. This river is also named as Śiva-gaṅgai, Vēgavati, Śiva-Jñānam, Vilambiti and Kritamālā."

* Vide *Vedic India*, p. 311.

If, then, the scene of *Manu's* appearance was in the land of the Tamils; if the penance of *the son of the Sun* was performed in the *Malaya*; if *Satyavrita* offered sacrifices on the river *Kritamālā*; and if the Divine Fish, which became the royal emblem of the Tamilian kings, appeared before the progenitor of the great nation in the ancient metropolis of the Pāṇḍiyans; would it not be right for the scientfic student of Indian antiquity to hold that the wise suggestion made by the learned professor, the late Mr. Sundaram Piḷḷai M. A., is perfectly correct? He observes: "The attempt to find the element of Hindu civilisation by the study of Sanskrit in Upper India is to begin the problem at its worst and most complicated point.........The scientific historian of India, then ought to begin his study with the basin of the Kṛishṇa, the Kāveri and the Vaigai rather than with the Gangetic plains as it has been now long, too long, the fashion."

Another branch of the Elamite race, after quitting their original home in Western Asia, marched through Baluchistan, entered India by the Bolan Pass and colonised the northern parts. The invading host was led by its chief, Bharatan, the strongest and bravest of them. When the territorial unit was formed he became the first of a line of kings. The Royal house as well as the settlement was known by the name of its founder. In latter days the name *Bharata*, as rightly observed by Dr. Oppert, in his *Original Inhabitants of India*, underwent many phonetic changes as Bhāra, Bāla, Ṗalla, Bhār, Bahar, Bār; Mhāra, Māla, Malla, Mhār, Mahar, Mār; Palva, Palhava, Pārthva, Paraiya; Brahui, Billa, Bhilla, Billāla; &c., &c. These names are philologically and sematologically identical with the name *Bharata*.*

---

* It is a peculiarity in the Tamilian tongues that when there are two consonants, one is sometimes dropped and the preceding vowel is lengthened instead. *Cf.* Veḷḷāḷa, Vēḷāḷa: Paḷḷa, Pāli: Mallas, Mālas or Māras, etc. The interchanges of *l* and *r*, as in Māras and Mālas and of *m*, *p*, and *b*, as in Mallas, Pallas or Baras are not uncommon in the Indian tongues.

The long chain of Brahui mountains extending from the northern frontier of India near the Bolan Pass continuously to Cape Monze in the Persian Gulf, was the western border of the Bharata land or Tamalic India. The Brahuis, the western borderers, are of the same stock as the Baluchis, and both bolong to the Tamiḻian or Bharatan race. The Brahuis (properly Barahis) and the Baluchis (correctly Balachis) are 'highlanders' and 'lowlanders' respectively, and are identical with the Paraiyas and Paḷḷas of Southern India and Māras or Maḷḷas and Bāras or Paḷḷas of Northern India.

The first syllable in the word "Brahui" was originally dissyllabic and authorities like Dr. Oppert and Mr. Masson also hold this view. *Bra* in *Brahui* is a corruption of *Bara* identical wlth *Bala* of *Balachis* and both are modifications of *Bharata*. Dr. Oppert recognises the name Baluchis as that of the ancient Bhalanas (a non-Āryan people), mentioned by the bards of the Ṛig Veda as living near the Bolan Pass."* Dr. Caldwell has lately pointed out the affinity of the Brahui dialect to the Tamiḻian group, though it was originally supposed to belong to the Iranian group of the Indo-European family of languages.† In like manner, although the dialect of the Baluchis is now considered as belonging to the Iranian group, a thorough research in the linguistic field will, we trust, disclose its affinity to the Tamilian family of languages.

Similarly, other branches of the Elamite race of Chaldea migrated westward into Europe and settled in various parts of the continent. These branches are represented by the Hungarians, the Finns and the Archaic Etruscans of Rome. "The Lapps (*included in the Finnic group*) though now using a Finnic idiom are not," Prof. Sayce remarks, "related to the Finns in blood." What slender reasons support the theory that the Accadians and their collateral branches of the East and the West belong to the same source as the

* *Vide, The Original Inhabitants of India*, p. 34.

† *The Dravidian Comparative Grammar*, Introduction, p. xxv.

mountainous races of the Uralic slopes, and the Ugric-Altaic ranges, as well as the original inhabitants of Central Asia, Africa, and Australia? They are all usually, but unscientifically, included under the name *Turanian*. It is, for instance, pointed out that the myths and legends of the latter people resemble those of the Accadians and Chaldeans and that their languages, and dialects are of the agglutinative character as those of the Finns and the Tamils. Alien races may borrow the idioms, myths and legends of others and use them; still they may vary in blood as the Lapps do from the Finns.

The old theory of Dr. Caldwell, Prof. Max Muller and others of their school, that the ancestors of the Tamilians entered India through the north-west boundary from Central Asia and were driven subsequently towards the south hy the pressure of the Āryans, is now generally considered as not resting on sufficient data. Dr. Macleane holds an opposite view and says, in his *Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency*, that if the Tamilians had moved from outside into India at all, it may more reasonably be conjectured that they came from the south or east, and this view agrees with that of Prof. Hæckel who holds *Lemuria*, the submerged land, to have been man's "primeval home." But however, we are not at all left hopelessly in the jungle of conjectures as regards the primeval home of the Tamilians. The whole nation preserves to this day the tradition of its native land. All the traditions point out a central place as their earthly paradise, and that in the land watered by the two rivers the Tigris and the Euphrates. The Brahuis state that their original home was in the Mount Haleb (Aleppo).* The modern Baluchis assert that their forefathers came from

* Dr. Caldwell, in his *Dravidian Comparative Grammar*, Introduction, p. xxv, says:—"The Brahuis state that their fore-fathers came from Haleb (Aleppo)." The Dr. goes on further stating, "but even if this tradition were to be regarded as a credible one it would apply to the secondary or conquering race of Indo-European origin, not to the aboriginal indigenous Dravidians." We do not know on what ground

Aleppo in Syria.* The Finns point out their home in Summir, a name applied both to the upper part of Chaldea and a mount in it as well.† The Accadians of Babylonia looked for their cradle in the Mount Elam, "the present Mount Elmond" which rises in the eastern plain of the lower Chaldea.‡ The tradition of the ancient people of India, as preserved in the *Purāṇas*, points out *Elam* as the native land of their fathers, identical with the civilised land of Elam. According to the *Purāṇas* Elam or Ela-*vritam* is situated in *Mēru*, "the mount." Vritam is a Sanskrit term denoting a country or land. They state that *Ela-vritam*, the mountain city, was the primeval home of the Devas and others who were classified as the eighteen *gaṇas* §, probably the eighteen sects of the Southern Tamilians.

All these traditions and records fully agree in tracing the cradle of the Bharatan or Tamilian race, not to Central Asia as conjectured by some, nor to the submerged Lemuria as others assume, but, to the land of Elam in Western Asia. And the course of their travel indicates that they came only from the west and not from any other direction. This is clear from the legend of Manu whose ark is narrated to have rested at the southern-most point of Drāviḍa and who himself is said to have been performed his penance in a certain part of the Malaya, which is no other than the mountainous range bordering Travancore. There does not seem to be any sign of the Tamilians having been forced or

---

Dr. Caldwell bases his opinion. We are sorry to note it is an unwarranted assertion.

* *Vide* the *Original Inhabitants of India*, by Dr. Oppert, Note 30, on p. 35.

† *Vide Encyclopædia Brittannica*, under the word 'Babylonia.'

‡ Sayce's *Introduction to the Science of Languages*, vol. ii, p. 191.

§ The eighteen *gaṇas* of the Sanskrit literatue are told to be the descendants mostly of Kāsipa, a Southern Rishi, through the daughters of Daksha, another Southern *Prajāpati*, who all lived in the South in ancient India.

compelled in any number whatsoever to move to the southern portion of the peninsula as is groundlessly believed by the writers of Āryan histories.

II. THEIR ORIGINAL STOCK AND RACIAL NAME.

The Elamite or Tamiḻian race that moved from Accadia towards the east was so numerous and prolific in ancient days that it domiciled the whole continent subsequently known as "The Bharata Khaṇḍam." Accordingly, there was originally "one simple and homogenous language from the Himālayas to the Indian Ocean." This language spoken by these pre-Āryan settlers was akin to the languages of Accadian-Chaldea. Mr. Taylor points out that the earliest probable refinement of this language was the *Pāli* of the North and the *Tamiḻ* of the South and that Sanskrit assumed its own form by engrafting numerous Chaldaic terms of science and others of common use on the old *Pāli*. Thus one and the same language of the ancient *Tamiḻic India* has received the two designations of *Pāli* in the North, and *Tamiḻ* in the South. Dr. Oppert derives the word 'Pāli' from the "Dravidian Paḷḷas" of the North to which race Kapila, the greatest philosopher of the ancient world, and Buddha, "the Light of the East" belong; and Dr. Pope assumes the name Tamiḻ to be a modification of the word, *Ten-moḻi*, "Southern Language."

The hand of time assisted by local influence transforms and gives colour to the tongues of the same family and thus separates one from the other. In the long run, the language of the north, the Pāli, unavoidably and inextricably mixed with the new intruder—the Āryan tongue—gave birth to the modern *Neo-Bharata Āryan* dialects of the Northern India; while the language of the south has preserved its purity and simplicity and stands now as the worthy and living representative of the family to which it belongs. The Southerners, in early days, thought it a sin to admit Āryan vocabulary into their sacred tongue and were scrupulously careful

to preserve intact their language as handed down to them by their ancestors. Even now the Tamil literati give more value to compositions free from the admixture of Sanskrit vocabulary.

This ancient language of the Bharata land is now confined to the southernmost part of the peninsula and is known only as one of the vernaculars of Southern India; yet an acute and critical student of the language will not fail to notice that Tamil is something more than a mere vernacular and is one of the two important classical languages of India. Oriental scholars unanimously agree in holding that Tamil "is one of the most ancient, copious, and refined languages spoken by man." But they are at variance in the discussion of the question as to which family or group the language and the race belong. Scientific students have already abandoned Dr. Caldwell's theory that the Tamilian race and language belong to a supposed Scythian group of the Turanian family.

Mr. C. E. Gover says: "Since the learned book by "Dr. Caldwell—*Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian* "*Languages*—was issued, it has been taken for granted that "the Tamils, etc., are a Turanian people. The progress of "philological enquiry and the new means of analysis furnish-"ed by the great German writers on language have shown "the error of this classification......As an interesting example "both of the true character of the language and the linguis-"tic progress made since the publication of Dr. Caldwell's "book, it may be noted that the learned Doctor gives an "appendix containing a considerable number of Dravidian "words which he asserts to be Scythian, and most efficient "witnesses to prove the Turanian origin of the language. "It is now known that every word in this list is distinctly "Āryan, although some of them have representatives in the "Finnish group of Turanian tongues—the group which has "been most constantly exposed to Āryan influences. The

"greater portion of them are included in Fick's *Indogerman-* "*iochen Grundsprache* as Āryan roots, 'although Fick does "not appear to have seen Dr. Caldwell's work.'" *

This view has been confirmed by the researches, of no less a Tamiḷ scholar than Prof. J. Vinson of Paris. He says: "I must add that I never admitted the existence of the "Turanian family; this is an absurd and inadmissible hypo- "thesis which neither facts nor reasoning can support. Each "group in the so-called family is quite independent from all "others, and exists by itself unconnected with one another; "such is the case with the Basque, the Ugro-Finnic, the "Dravidian, the Kolarian, the Japanese, the Maleo-Polyne- "sian, etc.......Dr. Caldwell's opinion that the Dravidian "may be related to a pretended Scythian group is equally "unfounded, and we can but assert as very stupid asserion, "which was presented by some amateurs, that Tamiḷ and "Australian are of the same origin. Nothing is more deceit- "ful than etymologies; and grammatical resemblance ought "to be accurately discussed." †

Not only Philology but even Ethnology is in favour of this assertion. From an Ethnological point of view the Tamiḷians do not racially belong to the Turanian (Mongoloid) family. Recent investigations go to prove that there is a marked mental and physical difference between the two species. Organic laws, on which we more strongly depend for the classification of races, establish that the *Dravidian* of Southern India belongs decidedly to the Caucasian melanochroid physical type of the human species, a branch of *Homo Caucasicus* of Mr. Keane. The physical characteristics of the Tamiḷian type are a dolichocephalic head, unmarked cheek bones, long, black and curly (but not woolly) hair, black and bright eyes, pointed if not aquiline (but never evidently platyrhine) nose, fair skin—the colour of it being

* *The Folk Songs of Southern India*, Intro., pp. 6 and 7.

† *The Light of Truth or the Siddhanta Dipika*, vol. v. p. 193.

fairer than No. 29 of Broce's colour types. These are the characteristic features of all South Indian castes or tribes that are admittedly Tamiḻian. The worthy personages of ancient India as Indra, Varuṇa, Yama, Rāma, Kṛishṇa, Arjuna and the host of others including the god Vishṇu and the goddess Umā are explicitly of this type and are described to have had but fair black skin.

Dr. Caldwell and Mr. Campbell acknowledge that the Dravidian physically belongs to the Caucasian type; yet they cannot scientifically account for it as *their* Dravidian comes from mongoloid origin and hails from Central Asia. Mr. Keane supposes that the Dravidians acquired their physical characteristics from the Āryans by long residence in close proximity to them. Such expressions given out by so eminent scholars as the above mentioned are but unwarranted and find no support or evidence in Ethnology. Scientists and Historians are puzzled when trying to account for the Mongolian origin and Caucasian features of the Tamiḻian peoples. It is a stumbling block to many an Ethnologist and Historian. As observed by us already, the Tamiḻian did not come from Mongolia, or the Altaic range; his original home was in the land of Elam including Asia Minor. He decidedly belonged to the Caucasian branch and sailed to Southern India through the Arabian Sea. The recognition of these facts will remove the difficulties of many an Indian Ethnologist and Historian.

Mr. Crooks and Mr. Keane hold an opinion that the Tamiḻians landed in South India from the South-Sea Islands called by them the *Indo-African Austral continent.* For the leading Ethnologists hold that there is a marked resemblance between the physical type of the Dravidians and that of certain Australian tribes. Prof. Simon says that "the features of the Australians with all their ugliness and coarseness frequently remind one of the Caucasian features." According to Quatrefages not only Caucasian but Negro and

Mongol elements exist in Australia. Giglioli believes of an Āryan element in Australia. Now, if the Caucasian type can be proved to be Tamil̤ian or Dravidian, it can be assumed that there was a Tamil̤ian migration into Australia in remotest times before the submersion of the southern continent. For a similar reason we find also Āryan, Mongoloid and Negro types in Australia. They were removed for ever from the original stock by the sudden inundation which overwhelmed the southern continent.

All the leading Ethnologists agree, as we have seen above, in believing in the Caucasian type of the Tamil̤ian peoples. And the Caucasian type is nearly allied to the Indo-European and differs altogether from the Mongoloid and Negroid types. We conclude the subject with the observations of Dr. Macleane as quoted in the *Encyclopœdia Britannica*: "They (the Dravidians) were, at one time, on the ground of the general structure of their languages, classed with the Mongoloid (Turanian-Scythian) and even the Australian races, but that classification is rejected by all the leading Ethnologists. They form in fact with the other members of the group, a separate and distinct family, which is of the dolichocephalic class, and which comes near the Indo-European or Āryan type."

We have seen from philological and ethnological points of view that the Tamil̤ian language and race greatly differ from the Turanian family. It may also be noted by an earnest student that by its classical nature and highest order the Tamil̤ian tongue would differ from those tongues with which it has been so long the practice to associate it, and it must be obvious that there is a wide gap which cannot be hoped to be filled up by those who claimed to have discovered the origin of the Dravidian and attributed to the same sources the derivation of totally unconnected races and languages.

In grammatical structure, in conception of ideas, in refinement of expressiveness, in its polish of prosody and

grandeur of literature, and in the development of the language, Tamil is surpassed by few, and has secured for itself a very high and envious status among the languages of the world. The quotations we give below from the writings of eminent Oriental scholars will prove the truth of these statements. Dr. Caldwell writes: "Grammatical gender "has been more fully and systematically developed in the "Dravidian tongues than in perhaps any other languages in "the world. Properly speaking there is no such thing as "gender in the Scythian language. Gender appears in the "Indo-European languages in the pronouns and pronominals "but not in the verb. In the Semitic languages, the verb "distinguishes from the masculine and feminine in the "singular; but in the plural, as in the verb of the Indo-"European languages, gender is ignored. In the Dravidian "languages, on the other hand, not only is there a full equip-"ment of sex-denoting pronouns, but there is the same "development of gender in the verb also. We have verbal "forms without the necessity of using the separate pronouns "as nominative for expressing *he is*, *she is*, *it is*, *they* "*(persons) are*, *they (things) are*. There is refinement of "expressiveness in which the Dravidian languages appear "to stand alone. Sanskrit is far less highly developed in "this particular, so that if there were any borrowing, the "Dravidian family must have been the lender, not the "borrower." (*Caldwell's C. D. G.* page 147.) The Rev. P. Percival, in his excellent book, *The Land of the Veda*, thus remarks:—"Perhaps no language combines greater "force with equal brevity; and it may be asserted that no "human speech is more close and philosophic in its expres-"sion as an exponent of the mind......The language, thus "specific, gives to the mind a readiness and clearness of con-"ception, whilst its terseness and philosophic idiom afford "equal means of lucid utterance." The Rev. W. Taylor, the well-known Dravidian scholar, in his *Catalogue Raisonnce of Oriental Mss.* (vol. 1, p. 5) thus declares:—"It is desirable

"that the polish of the Telugu and Tamil poetry should be "better known in Europe so that competent judges might "determine whether the high distinction accorded to Greek "and Latin poetry as if there were nothing like it in the "world is perfectly just." Dr. Winslow observes that "it "is not extravagant to say that in its poetic form, the "Tamil is more polished and exact than the Greek and more "copious than the Latin. In its fulness and power it more "resembles English and German than any other living "languages." In the opinion of Charles E. Gover the "Tamilians possess one of the noblest literatures the world has seen." As regards the absurdity of affiliating the Tamilian family with the Turanian, the latter savant, in his excellent work, *The Folk Songs of Southern India*, thus declares:—"These such witnesses, added to the hundreds, "this book contains, suffice to show that, whether as regards "literature or morals, the Dravidian people are deserving "of and entitled to the honour of omission from the Turanian "family." (Introduction, p. ix.)

It will not be out of place here to note what place the Turanian people occupy among the nations of the world. The general opinion of scholars, as a rule, is that the 'Turanian peoples display an utter want of moral elevation.' Their languages are poor in literature; they have no high moral ideas; and their aspirations are low. Mr. Farrar, the learned author of *Families of Speeches*, (page 155), thus remarks: "We may say generally that a large number of them (the Turanian peoples) belong to the lowest palœzoic strata of humanity—peoples whom no nation acknowledges as its kinsman, whose languages, rich in words for all that can be eaten or handled, seem absolutely incapable of expressing the reflex conceptions of the intellect or the higher forms of the consciousness, whose life seems confined to the glorification of the animal wants with no hope in the future and no pride in the past. They are for the most part people

without a literature and without a history, and many of them apparently as imperfectible as the *Ainos* of Jesso or the *Veddhas* of Ceylon,—peoples whose tongues in some instances have twenty names for murder, but no name for love, no name for gratitude, no name for God." Such is the description of the race to which the earliest civilised nation of the world was supposed to belong! Even among these Turanian peoples, Dr. Caldwell is pleased to give the Tamilians a place in the Scythian group. The reason which he assigns is "the term Scythian having already been used in the classics in a vague, undefined sense, to denote generally the barbarous tribes of unknown origin that inhabited the Northern parts of Asia and Europe, it seems to be the most appropriate and convenient word which is available." An appropriate name indeed to a people who distinguished themselves in the ancient world and to a tongue which is, in the opinion of an accomplished Orientalist, 'one of the most copious, refined and polished languages spoken by man'!!

From the above observations it can be seen that the Tamilians are not to be associated with the Turanians, whoever they may be, and that there is a great gulf between these two peoples that cannot be bridged over by any means. Hence the Tamils and their language are to be placed under a separate group. It is to this group that most of the languages and peoples of Northern and Southern India, the Chaldean, the Accadian and the Lykian of the ancient Western Asia, the modern Hungarian, the Finnic and the archaic Etruscan of Europe, etc., belong. When the unscientific name "Turanian" is found to be no more applicable to these races and languages, the difficulty naturally arises as to by what denomination they are to be signified. The common term "Dravidian" having been often used in a narrow and limited sense to denote only the South Indian people, cannot admit of a wider extension to be freely applied

to all the allied races. In the preface to his learned work—*The Original Inhabitants of India*, Dr. Oppert, met by the same difficulty, remarks that "the branch which is domiciled in India should, according to my opinion, be called *Bharatan*, because the *Bharatas* were in olden times is most numerous and most honoured representatives." Philologically it has been possible to derive the names of the numerous tribes and castes inhabiting India from the word "Bharatan." Although the name suggested by Dr. Oppert is more representative in character than "Dravidian" still on account of its significance being by long usage limited only to the people within India, it cannot be safely adopted as a generic name. As languages and races derive their generic name from the most developed and civilised representatives of their family and as Tamil is the only most ancient, cultivated and polished living representative in the group, it seems proper to disignate the whole family by the name "Tamilian".

III. THEIR ANCIENT CIVILISATION AND OCCUPATION.

We now come to examine the condition of the people of "Tamilic India", the degree of civilisation attained and social progress made by them, before the advent of the Āryans into the land. The material prosperity of a country depends upon its favourable situation; maritime intercourse enlarges commerce and enriches the nation; peaceful and industrial habits of the people no less adds to the wealth of the country. The people of the North were disturbed by successive waves of foreign invasions. Armed with the sword they were often compelled to defend their hearth and save their kith and kin. There was neither security of person nor of property. The people of the South were, on the other hand, more fortunate; they were engaged in no bloody or costly wars which emptied the coffers of a country; pirates were unknown in the southern seas and there was tranquility in the land. On account of the vicinity of the sea they commanded extensive trade, and commerce extended

3

to all the maritime countries and civilised parts of the world then known. Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt traded with India. The land flourished; people of the South grew richer and thrived better than their brethren in the North. They enjoyed the blessings of continued peace and held a very influential position among the then civilised nations, on account of their maritime pursuits and commercial enterprise. "The sea voyages were frequent, for there is clear evidence of a regular sea trade between Babylonia and parts of the South-West Coast of India. And the way is further opened for probable guesses as to the habits of the pre-Āryan conquerors of India, in that these merchant sailors were mostly Dravidians, not Āryans. Such Indian names of the goods as were adopted in the West (Solomon's ivory, apes,* and peacocks, for instance, and the word 'rice) were adoptions not of Sanskrit or Pali but of Tamiḻ words." (*Madras Mail, 28th Sept. 1903.*)

Nor did they enjoy less the fertility of the land. 'The earth was so bountiful in its mineral resources that gold flowed with the torrent of its rivers, and diamonds glittered on the mountain sides, while pearls and coral reefs covered the depths of the seas, and there flourished in spontaneous growth the spices that perfumed the royal tables.' The royal palaces and magnificent temples of neighbouring countries have borne witnesses to the extensive groves of *Teak* and *Sandal* that graced the lofty mountains and luxuriant forests; profusion of rain and numberless rivers fertilized the soil, and the plains were clothed with green verdure. We see the Tamilians were a race not only of enterprising traders but also of assiduous agriculturists and that they had reached the agricultural stage of civilisation before their advent into this

* We beg to note here that the Hebrew word for ape is "goph," and is not a Tamilian designation; the Hebrews must have known apes and their designation in Egypt. For every article that was imported by sea from India into Babylonia brought with it a Tamilian name.

land. This may be illustrated from the two terms *Nāḍu*(நாடு) and *Ūr* (ஊர்) which signify *country* and *town* respectively. *Nāḍu*, "planted ground" comes from *naḍu* (நடு), "to plant," and is applied to country; and *Ūr*, "that which is surrounded by paddy fields," is derived from the root *uḻu* (உழு) or *ur* (உர்) "to plough," and applied to town. This brings out what the Tamilian conception of country and town was even then. It is worthy of note here that the capital of the ancient Chaldeans was named *ūr*, and of the Romans *Urbs*, both identical with the Tamilian word *ūr*.*

---

* The term *ūr* (ஊர்), "town" or "village," lit: that which is surrounded by plough-lands, is derived from *ulu* (உழு), "to plough." Its original form is *ur* (உர்), yet found in Tulu, one of the offshoots of the ancient tongue of the Bharata land. The sound *l* (ழ) and *r* (ர) are interchangeable in the Tamilian tongues as it is in the Āryan; Cf. *ilu* (இழு) and *ir* (ஈர்), "draw" and the Latin, *eruo*, "I draw"; *elu* (எழு) and *ēr* (ஏர்), "to rise," and *or* as in *orient*, "rising" or "the east." The primitive root of *ur* (உர்) or *ulu* (உழு) is *ar* and it has undergone a phonetic modification an *er* and then *ur*; in its fourth stage the word is now in use in Tamiḻ. It may be seen that the word has passed its three stages before the race separated as we can note this from the name of the Accadian capital which is known by the name *Ur*.

The permutation of the vowels *a*, *e* and *u* can be studied from the following: *paru* (பரு) and *peru* (பெரு), "great"; *eri* (எரி) "fire" and *uri* (Tulu and Can.) and *uro* (Latin), "I burn." Though the roots *ar*, *er*, *ur*, which mean ploughing, are lost in Tamiḻ, they survive in the following words: *ar* in *āru* (Can.), "ploughing" and *āriyar*, "ploughers"; *er* in *eru* (எரு) "manure", *erudu* (எருது), "oxen" or "ploughing animal", *erumai* (எருமை) "buffalo"; *ēr* (ஏர்) "ploughing instrument", and *erukku* (எருக்கு), "to cut"; *ur* in *uram* (உரம்) &c. Compare with the above the Latin *aro* and the Greek *aro-o*, "I till." All the Indo-European words which designate the plough and its uses contain the root *ar*, *er*, *ir* and *or*. Dr. Schledge connects them wirh Sanskrit *ri* which he thinks to mean to cut. Dr. Caldwell does not agree with Dr. Schledge and thinks that the Indo Germanic words to have relationship not with the Sanskrit root *ri*, "to go", but with the Tamilian root *ar*, "to cut." He says; "I should then also have felt surer of

From the term *Nāḍu* opposed to *Kāḍu* "forest" lit, "that which is difficult of access," we are justified in concluding that what occupied the attention of the Tamilians first and foremost in their colony was to clear the forest and to cultivate the land. The immortal poet thus utters: "Those who till enjoy plenty and happiness; the rest being followers and servants of the great, depend on their assistance." (*Kuṟaḷ.*) How different is this from the assumption of Mr. Dutt that the art of agriculture spread from the north to the south and all from a fanciful and an ingenious reconstruction of the great stories! He says in his *Ancient India*: "As in the *Mahābhārata*, so in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the heroes are myths pure and simple. Sītā, 'the field furrow,' had received divine honours from the time of the Rig Veda and had been worshipped as a goddess. When cultivation gradually spread towards Southern India it was not difficult to invent a poetical myth that Sītā was carried to the south." This seems to us to be a conception for which stronger reasons are required in addition to the statement of an ingenious interpretation.

It was the wealth of the country increasing by maritime trade and natural fertility that attracted the foreigners from all other parts of the civilised world. And we are taught to think that the "Indo-Syrian" trade had its beginning some millenniums before the time of King Solomon and before the advent of the Āryans, "a receptive and docile people," as Prof. Armitage calls them, into the Bharata land. The Hebrew empire of David, after rapid conquests, took possession of the (Indo-Syrian) Caravan route, over which the Hebrews got the mastery in the reign of Solomon who consolidated the empire founded by his father. Prof. Max

---

the relationship of the Dravidian words with the Indo-European; *ar*, "to cut" being an undoubtedly Dravidian root and probably the origin of *ür* (Can.) "a plough." The radical meaning of *ri* (Sans.) however seems rather to be to *run* (Caldwell's "Comparative Dravidian Grammar" p. 477.)

Muller first pointed out that the names of certain rare articles which King Solomon's trading ships brought him were not originally Hebrew, and their native names traced through Hebrew corruptions have been set down by him as Sanskrit. But lately Dr. Caldwell brought proofs to show that these are corruptions of pure Tamiḻ introduced in the Hebrew texts with the imported articles, native to the Tamiḻ soil.

We read in the *Book of Kings I*, that "the navy of Solomon with that of Hiran brought him once in three years gold and silver, ivory and apes and peacocks." And another passage in the same text reads thus: "And they came to Ophir and fetched from thence gold 420 talents and brought it to King Solomon. (*I, Kings IX*, 27-28.) Early writers identified Ophir with a certain place in South Africa. Recently, a writer in the *Indian Review* brought strong proofs to show Ophir as the town Supera situated five miles to the north of Bassein in the Bombay Presidency. But have we not every reason to suppose that Ophir which exported gold and sandalwood indigenous to the Western Ghats and nowhere else, with other rare articles known by their Tamiḻ names to the Western world, should be a seaport within the Tamiḻ land near the mountainous range of Malaya between Tinnevelly and Travancore? Dr. Pope also observes that "Gold was found in the South in abundance from pre-historic times" (*Vide* Dr. Pope's *Nālaḍiyār*, p. 295, under the word இரும்பு).

If all these considerations are taken together we shall be forced to conclude that, in all probability, the 'Ophir' of the Hebrew text should be no other place than Ovari, (correctly Uvari, உவரி,) "seaport", now a small fishing village to the south of Tuticorin, but a seaport in bygone days near Koṟkai, the older metropolis of the Pāṇḍiyan Kings. The late Mr. Thomas Nāḍār, M. A. an eminent Sanskrit scholar, has also expressed the same opinion in an article contributed by him to the "Christian College Magazine," (Vol. VII,

No. 9), Koṟkai, "long the emporium of South Indian trade," was the capital of the Pāṇḍiyan dynasty till the 9th century B.C. when Madura was built.* Tradition says that the modern Koṟkai, a village situated on the bank of the *Tāmbraparaṇi* alias *Porunai*, is the remnant of the once famous city extending eastward to the sea, which has now retreated seven miles from its old position. And the modern *Uvari*, "the seaport," formed a *Pauk* (பாக்கம்—derived from பக்கம், "closeness") of the ancient city. People in the neighbourhood say that the sand mounds seen to this day in the suburbs of *Uvari* mark the spots where the gold mines were once worked and they assert that when rain falls in abundance the peasants even to-day go to the mounds and pick up gold grains in the washed sand. From the above-mentioned

---

* It is no longer a matter for dispute but a veritable historical fact as well established as any fact yet known in the history of Southern India, that Kūn Pāṇḍiyan, *alias* Sundara Pāṇḍiyan (கூன்றசீர் நெடுமாறன்), the contemporary of the great Šaiva Gurus, Jñāna Sambhandha and Appar, reigned in the early part of 7th cent. A. D. This Kūn-Pāṇḍiyan is the seventy-third in succession from Kulasekhara who built the modern Madura. If it be granted that that each king reigned at an average for about 20 years, it will bring Kulasekhara's reign in the 9th century B.C. This is corroborated by another fact Simon Casie Chitty, the learned author of the *Ceylon Gazetteer*, in his *Tamil Plutarch* says:—"All accouuts concur in assigning the foundation of the Pāṇḍiya Kingdom at Madura to Kulasekhara Pāṇḍian; but they are at considerable variance with regard to the time when that event happened. Some place it as high up as B.C. 1500, while others bring it down to a later period; but we have reasons to believe that it could not have been later than, at least, the 9th century B.C., for from the fact of Vijaya, who founded the Singhalese dynasty in Ceylon in B.C. 243, marrying the daughter of a Pāṇḍiyan, and the Pāṇḍiyan sending along with her to Ceylon a retinue of seven hundred daughters of his nobility, together with eighteen officers of state, and seventy-five menial servants, besides elephants, horses, and chariots, as recorded in the Mahāvanso, it would appear that the Pāṇḍiya Kingdom was not then in its infancy, but fully organised and at the lowest calculation a few centuries old."

facts and unbroken traditions of centuries we may infer that the Pāṇḍiyan kingdom of the South had reached a high degree of civilisation, so early as the 10th cent. B. C., the time when Solomon reigned in Judea.

We have also earlier records of Dravidian sea voyages, and their maritime enterprise. There are scattered indications of these in the *Samhita* or Collection of the *Rig Veda*, the oldest existing record of the Āryans, even the latest of which could not have been later than 1200, B. C.. It is said of Varuṇa in the first Maṇḍala, Hymn xxv—7, that "He knows the path of the sea, and knows the ships that are therein." In the seventh Maṇḍala, Hymn LXXXVIII, 3, we read thus :—

When Varuṇa and I embarked together and urged
Our boat into midst of ocean,
When we rode over the ridges of the waters we
Swing within that swing and we were happy."*

We hear of Varuṇa from the ancient literatures of the land, as the master of the sea, and the Lord of the western coast. According to the *Mahābhārata* his reign was in the western sea coast just opposite to the modern Nizam's Dominions.† It is also reported in the *Mahābhārata*, Ādiparva, that Varuṇa was married to Divi, the daughter of Sukra, the famous high priest and the preceptor of the Aśuras. And a section of the Rākshas known as Niritis, from Niriti, is said to have descended from Varuṇa and dwelt in those early days in the most South-Western part of the peninsula. We have shown elsewhere that the Aśuras and the Rākshas, the Rulers of ancient India, were different sections of the Tamiḷian nation.‡

---

* Translation by Ralph T. H. Griffith.

† See the map given by Dr. Macleane in his "Manual of the Madras Administration."

‡ See our article on the "Admixture of Aryan with Tamilian" in the *Light of Truth or the Siddhānta Dīpika*, Vol. IV, Nos. 5, 7, 10, 11, 12.

We should also note here that not only the region of Varuṇa, one of the eight protectors or lords of the eight cardinal points, but also the regions of others were situated in South India as it may be inferred from descriptions contained in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. South India, then, had the reputation to be known to the ancient world as "the land of the gods and fairies," and the mount *Malaya*, in it, is called *Pothiyil*, "the common home of the Devas." Varuṇa and his colleagues, though chiefs of the ancient Tamil land are extolled as "gods of the Āryas" and receive honours and praises in the Rig Veda. This fact also brings out to the front some useful information regarding the pre-Āryan conquerors of the land.

Nevertheless, the use of the word Manā in the *Rig Veda* to denote a definite quantity of gold, which is traceable to Chaldea and Babylonia with the same meaning, as well as the above inferences of sea and sea-going ships points clearly to a well established commercial intercourse between "Dravidian India" and "Chaldean Babylonia." Then again one of the precious things that the old Babylonians imported into their country "comes to the fore with a bit of very choice information, namely, that the old Babylonian name for *Muslin* was Sindu, that is, that the stuff was called, simply by the name of the country which exported it." And Zenoile A. Ragozin in her *Vedic India* goes on to remark that the export of muslin points to the fact that it was from another people different from the Āryans that it came; since it cannot be supposed that the Āryans were acquainted with the sea or ships, and she believes that those other people were only the *Dravidians*.*

---

* Compare line 5 in verse from Kalittogai, extracted in p. 92 *Siddhānta Dīpika* Vol. I:

"உருவஞ்சாதிடை காட்டுமுடை கழலந்துகில்".

Where the cloth adorning a child is said not to conceal its person.

All these important facts corroborated by another discovery conclusively prove that South India had commercial intercourse with other countries from a very early period. "In the ruins of Mugheir, the ancient Ur of Chaldea, built by Ur-Ea, the first king of united Babylonia, who ruled not less than three thousand years B. C., was found a piece of Indian *teak*. This evidence is exceptionally conclusive, because, as it happens, this particular tree is to be located with more than ordinary accuracy: it grows in Southern India (Dakkhan) where it advances close to the Malabar Coast and nowhere else; there is none to the north of the Vindhya." (*Vedic India*, p. 305, by Z. A. Ragozin.)

In the absence of contradicting facts, we believe ourselves justified by the reasons stated and authorities quoted above, in drawing the inference that this commercial intercourse of the Tamiḷians had its beginning some 5,000 years ago. In those days the enterprising Phœnician mariners and wealthy Babylonian merchants entered the land of the *Pāndees*, through the lower Euphrates—known as the "Indo-Syrian Trade Route," made purchases and sold the articles to the civilised countries of the west. This commercial intercourse of the Tamiḷians with the then civilised countries from pre-historic times till the break-up of Alexander's Asiatic Empire, brought immense wealth to the land, and was the chief cause of their attainment to a high degree of civilisation which ates contemporaneously with that of Chaldea, Babylonia and Egypt.

All these external evidences receive additional force when examined under the light of an internal evidence which the Tamiḷian literature itself provides. The ancient works of the land speak of 196 Pāṇḍiyan kings who were successively the patrons of three ancient Academies. The last of them was *Ukkira- Peruvaḷuthi* who reigned at Madura about the first century A. D.* Taking him to be the last of the

* The ancient Tamiḷ classics disclose that Pāṇḍiyan *Ukkira-peruvaḷuthi* preceded Chola Karikāla the Great, by some decades. We

above-mentioned series of patrons to the Sańgams, and giving an average of 20 years per sovereign, the date of the inauguration of the Sańgam falls not less than 3000 B. C. It is remarkable enough that this period coincides with the building of the 'Ur' of the United Babylonia, in the ruins of which the above-mentioned piece of Indian *teak* was discovered, which is held to have taken place about 5,000 years from the present day. As all these facts prove that the Tamilians had attained to an advanced stage of civilisation and had an organised government at so early a time as 5,000 years ago, their civilisation must certainly have begun at a far remoter antiquity.

---

learn from *Puṟanāṉūṟu* that the former was a contemporary of *Peru-naṟ-kiḷḷe* who, according to *Kalingathu-paraṇi*, preceded Karikāla. Besides, *Uruva-pahṟer Ilajñ-Chetchenni*, the father of Karikāla, is one of the heroes sung by Paraṇar and Perum-kunṟūr-Kiḻār. From inferences we gather from *Puṟam* and other ancient classics, it is obvious that the above mentioned poets Paraṇar and Perum-kunṟūr-Kiḻār with Auvai and Kapilar were contemporaries and flourished during the reign of Ukkira-peru-vaḻuthi, a friend of Peru-nar-kiḷḷi already referred to. (*Vide* lyric 367, in *Puṟam*.)

Karikāla, the Great, is the hero of many ancient Tamiḻ songs. Two of the Ten-Idyls are sung in his honour. He is referred to in *Silap*, a composition of the 2nd century A. D. He is also sung about in several lyrics of *Puṟa-nāṉūṟu*. The period of the reign of this Great monarch is fixed by Mr. Kanagasabai Piḷḷai, as the latter half of the 1st century of the Christian Era, between years 50 and 95. (*Vide*, "The Tamils ; Eighteen hundred years ago" p. 66.)

It is thus evident from literature, that Ukkira-peru-vaḻuthi preceded Karikāla by a few decades and Karikāla having existed between the years 50 and 95 A. D., we can safely assign the date of Ukkira-peru-vaḻuthi's reign as the first half of the first century of the Christian Era.

THE SOLAR AND THE LUNAR RACES OF INDIA.

WHO ARE THEIR MODERN REPRESENTATIVES?

BY

V. J. THAMBY PILLAI Esqr., M.R.A.S. *(Ceylon.)*

India is, like China, a very old country. But, unlike that country, it possesses no records of its past history. The only materials available to the historian for forming an idea about the state of ancient India are the traditions and legends preserved in the literature of the Hindus, together with some fragments of information which a few Greek writers thought fit to commit to writing in the early centuries of our era. By a study of these a few eminent scholars of Europe have attempted to penetrate into the mysteries of its primitive* condition. Some of the inferences on which they appear to be agreed may be mentioned here. They maintain that the ancestors of the Sanskrit-speaking peoples were strangers to India, who entered it in remote ages through the passes of the Hindu-Kush ranges; that they found it occupied by aboriginal races identical with the Aśuras, Danavas, Dasas, etc., of the Sanskrit classics; that they kept up a prolonged warfare with these races till they defeated them utterly and reduced them to a state of complete subordination to them and that, in course of time, these subjugated races formed the Sūdra caste of the Brahmanical policy. The hymns of the Rig-Veda, which refer to the battles of Indra against the Aśuras, Vala and Vritra, are supposed to relate to some of these ancient wars. Some have identified these aborigines with a Tibetan tribe, and others with an ancient race of whom the Dravidian is the present representative.

* Please consult any European writer on "Indian Antiquities."

The expedition of Rāma, as described in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is held to have resulted in the permanent extension of the religion and the political power of the Brahmanical tribes among the peoples of the Dravidas. The Pāṇḍiyas of Madura have been held to be an offshoot of the Lunar Branch of the Brahmanical race which had very early established itself in the extreme South. In short, the 'Deva' races of the classics are now represented by the Northern races of India, while the Dravidians, and the other tribes which occupy the extent of the country between the Vindhya hills and the sea, are identical with the Dasas and Aśuras of the Vedic hymns.

It is proposed to investigate whether the above conclusions are really supported, as they are alleged to be, by the *Itihāsās* and *Purāṇas* of the Hindus.

As the first step in this enquiry, I would mention the fact that the Indian classics refer to various communities or races which inhabited ancient India under the name of "the eighteen Gaṇas or the Bhūta Gaṇas" as they are sometimes called, over whom the god Śiva or Dakshiṇā-Mūrti, *i. e.*, the god of the South, presided. The Following are their appellations, viz :—

1. Aśurar (அசுரர்)
2. Amarar (அமரர்)
3. Taittiyar (தைத்தியர்)
4. Sittar (சித்தர்)
5. Karuḍar (கருடர்)
6. Kinnarar (கின்னரர்)
7. Nirutar (நிருதர்)
8. Kimpuruḍar (கிம்புருடர்)
9. Gantaruvar (கந்தருவர்)
10. Iyakkar (இயக்கர்)
11. Viñchaiyar (விஞ்சையர்)
12. Pūtar (பூதர்)
13. Pisāsar (பிசாசர்)
14. Antarar (அந்தரர்)
15. Munivar (முனிவர்)
16. Nākar (நாகர்)*
17. Ākāya Vāsikaḷ (ஆகாய வாசிகள்)
18. Pōka Pūmiyor (போக பூமியோர்) or Kuruvor (குருவோர்), *i. e.*, the inhabitants of Kuru Shetram.

* For an account of the birth of the Nākars, *i, e.*, Nāgas vide *Mahā Bhārata* Ādi Parvam, Chap. xvi, 6—12.

The origin of these Gaṇas,* as far as it can be gathered from the Sanskrit literature, is as follows:—

(1) Aŝurar or Taittiyar † were the descendants of Kāsipar by Diti, daughter of Takkan.

(2) Surar or Amarar ‡ were the descendants of Kāsipar by Aditi, daughter of Takkan.

(3) Karuḍar were the descendants of Kāsipar by Vinatai, daughter of Takkan.

(4) Munivar were the descendants of Kāsipar by Muni, a daughter of Takkan.

(5) Iyakkar consisted of two clans, one, the descendants of Kásipar by Kiridai, daughter of Takkan, the other, the descendants of Pulastya, grandfather of Rāvaṇan.

(6) Pūtar and Nākar were the descendants of Kāsipar by Surasai and Katturu, daughters of Takkan.

(7) Kinnarar and Gantaruvar consisted of three clans, one, the descendants of Kāsipar by Arittai, daughter § of Takkan, the other, the descendants of Pulastiya, while the third clan were the children of Aṅgiran and Sanapati.

(8) Kimpuruḍar were the descendants of Pulahan.

(9) Vānarar consisted of two clans, one the descendants of Vāyu, the other, the descendants of Pulastya.

(10) Nirutar were the descendants of Ataruman by Niruti. Ataruman was the son of Varuṇan by Divi, daughter of Sukran, son of Piruhu (Sanskrit Brigu), a Vedic saint.

From the above, it is perfectly clear that the majority of the Gaṇas were the offsprings of Kāsipar and ¶ Takkan.

---

* For a detailed account of the birth of the several Gaṇas, etc., see *Mahā Bhārata*, *Ādi Parva*, Chaps. 65, 66 and 95.

† Aŝuras, Taittiyar, Dāṇavar, Avuṇar, and Rākshas are used indiscriminately in the Indian classics to denote the primitive races or rulers of India.

‡ Vide *Mahā Bhārata Ādi Parva*, Sec. LXV.

§ For a detailed account of the descendants of Takkan (Sans. Daksha) vide *Mahā Bhārata Ādi Parva*, Chap. xcv.

¶ *Vide* "The Āryan Witness," by Rev. Bannerjee, p. 18.

Kāsipar was the father of the Sun, *i. e.*, he was a member of the Solar race, and it follows, therefore, that the Aśuras or the Taittiyar whom the Indian classics identify with the earliest rulers of the country were themselves members of the Solar race, from which Ikshvaku, * the great Solar conqueror, sprang in subsequent times. Thus it would seem that the great races of ancient India called the Rākshas, Aśuras, and Devas, were all kindred tribes of the Solar race, of which the Rākshas or Aśuras represented senior branch.

The theory that the Devas were a race altogether distinct and separate from the aboriginal rulers of Bhāratavarsha is thus seen to be flatly opposed to the Purāṇic accounts of the pedigree of the Gaṇas whom the primitive Indian, in so far as his myths and legends may be relied on, evidently believed to be of common origin. For the *Purāṇas* and the *Itihāsas* likewise insist that the races of ancient India were divided into two great main sections called the Devas, and the Dānavas or Rākshas, who ethnologically belonged to the same family or race.† It is the uniform testimony of Hindu literature that the Dānavas and the Devas, though enemies, were in reality brothers. In Amarakosha,‡ the Dānavas and Rākshas are classified under the head " Deva Yonies," i. e., the offsprings of the gods.

From these facts, it is clear that the Devas, § and the Aśuras were people of a purely common origin and members, not of two different nationalities, but of, essentially, the same race, who, in all probability, spoke also the same language. The theory that the Devas and the Rākshas of the classics represent the ancestors, respectively, of the Sanskritians and

*Vide *Râmâyaṇa* Uttara Kāṇḍam, Sec. 11.

† Vide *Maha Bharata* Udyoga Parva, Chap. C, Sloka. 18.

‡ The "Deva Yonies" comprised the Rākshas, Apsaras, Kinnaras, Kimpuruḍar, Kantharuvar and Yakshas. We find a reference to the "Rākshas" in the Rig Veda. *Vide* Maṇḍalam vii, lxiv. 2 and lxxxix-1.

§ By " Devas " is here meant " the Vedic race.''

the Tamilians, is thus seen to be manifestly untenable, if the ethnological conditions implied in the legends are to be considered to be of any consequence whatever in this investigation, unless it can be supposed that the Sanskritian who is, on all hands, allowed to have brought with him an extremely fair skin when he first entered the land of Bharata was such an expert in matters of anthropology and so singularly free from all social prejudice and bias that he was ready to admit that the pre-settlers though separated from him by differences of colour and language, were but his veritable brothers in blood.

Secondly, the *Itihāsas* and the *Puraṇas* expressly state that the Rākshas, or Aśuras, were the descendants of Yadu,* the progenitor of the Yādavas of the *Mahā Bhārata* fame. Kṛishṇa belonged to this race, and, as it will be admitted that the dynasty of Dvāraka was of Deva origin, the identity of race of the Aśuras and the Devas of the classics can hardly be questioned. Moreover, there are instances in Sanskrit literature of the application † of the very name 'Aśura' to the prominent leaders of the 'Deva' race.

Thirdly, the Rākshas according to the *Itihāsas* were more a South Indian than a North Indian race. The scenes of the events described in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Skanda Purāṇa* are all associated with the Southern regions. ‡ The South was "the direction in which the Rākshas resided." Laṅka was one of the most ancient strongholds of the Aśuras who were originally the paramount rulers of all the three worlds.§ They were called the Pūrva Devas, *i. e.*, the primi-

* The legend goes that Yadu disobeyed his father Yayāti and hence became the progenitor of the Rākshas. *Vide* Mahā Bhārata.

† This has been noticed by Rev. Bannerjee. *Vide* preface to his "Aryan Witness."

‡ Vide *Mahā Bhârata* Udyoga Parva, Chap. CIX.

§ The three worlds may mean the three ancient dominions of Tamilagam. In one of the *Pattu-Pāṭṭu* *i. e.*, மதுரைக்காஞ்சி it is stated that Rāvaṇa was expelled by a Pāṇḍiyan from the Tamiḻ land. (Editor).

tive Devas. South India was, unquestionably, the home of the Dravidian from the remotest times, as neither tradition nor legend favours the opinion that there is, at present, any remnant of a race which preceded the Tamil-speaking races in the ownership of the Pāṇḍiyan country. It follows, therefore, from these considerations, that the Aśura brothers of the Vedic race were none but the ancestors of some sections of the Tamilians—a conclusion fatal to the theory that the Vedic race were identical with the primitive Sanskritians.

Fourthly, the classics are agreed as to the prevalent complexion of the Rākshas, that it was almost black. Admitting that the Aśuras, a brother clan of the Devas, were a very swarthy race, is it possible to conclude that the Devas, unlike their kindred, were an extremely light-skinned race? And yet this is the conclusion which has found universal acceptance to-day. But the evidence available is emphatically to the contrary, as one might indeed expect under the circumstances. For we learn that almost all the prominent heroes among the ancient Āriyas or Devas, viz., such as Kṛishṇa, Vishṇu, Upendra, Indra, Rāmā, Arjuna, Bhīma, etc., were all swarthy-looking individuals.

But it is said that the epithets of contempt, such as "the noseless ones," "born of a black womb," etc., which the Vedic Āryas applied to the 'Dasyus,' distinctly imply a vast difference of colour as well as of race between the former and the latter. In order to arrive at a correct conclusion on this point, it is necessary to remember the fact that, according to the Aitereya Brāhmaṇa, the enemies of the Āryas or the Dasyu or 'Dasas,' as they are called, were themselves Āriyas, being the descendants of Visvāmitra who was an Āryan Kshatriya. The Brāhmanical fabrication that the 'Nishadas' * sprang from the thighs of the impious King

* The "Nishadas" are said to have been the progeny of Visvāmitra. It has often been assumed by Western writers that the Dasyus were the same as the Nishadas, and I have here availed myself of this assumption. It does not matter if the identification is wrong, for that the Nishadas were a black race can hardly be contradicted.

'Vena' has been quoted by some writers, as containing a vague hint about the non-Āryan affinities of the 'Dasas' of the Vedic hymners. It is remarkable that, in this respect, the most material point has been uniformly overlooked. I mean, the fact that the Aśuras and the Devas were brothers, and that there are instances in the Vedas themselves of the appellation 'Aśura' being used to denote the Great Ārya worthies, such as Varuṇa, Indra, etc. This being so, it is only resonable to suppose that, if there had existed any difference as regards complexion between the Āryas of Indra who was "black" himself and their opponents, it must have been, mainly, one of degree only. And it need hardly be thought a curious thing that the leader of the Āryas should have been a swarthy-skinned person as he was as much a 'Kausika' himself as 'Visvāmitra who, judging from the complexion of his progeny, must have been a very 'nigger.' The theory of "white Āryas" is, thus, seen to be ill-supported by the traditions and writings of India. However black or dark-skinned the 'Dasyus' might have been, there need be no doubt as to the fact of the prevailing complexion of the Vedic Āryas having been also very much akin to that of their much despised opponents. We have no warrant to assume or believe that the average complexion of the Āryas was anything vastly different from that of their prominent heroes, such as Vishṇu, Rāmā, Kṛishṇa, Arjuna, Aiyanār, and Indra, who were all dark-skinned personages.

The Vedic Dasyus were, doubtless, a very black race, like the Veddhas of Bínntenne, whom an average Tamiḷ would usually call "a black race." It is the habit of the people of this country to call a person "black" if he happens to be a shade or two darker than the ordinary run. The late Mr. Neville* has mentioned an instance of one clan of the Ceylon *Veddhas* calling another "black fellows" on account of the latter's complexion being a little darker than theirs.

*Vide his "Taprobanian."

The question to be decided, then, is not what complexion the sentimentalism of individuals or races will condescend to call "black" or "white," but what the Āryas of the Vedic hymns meant when they spoke of a black skin. The complexion of individuals and races is admitted to undergo marvellous alterations in process of time owing to a variety of causes. Drs. Caldwell and Oppert * have written strongly in favour of this view. It cannot, therefore, be held that the present complexion of a race affords a correct clue to what it was three thousand years ago. The fact should be borne in mind that it is a misrepresentation to call the whole Dravidian race "a black race." "Not one of the epithets expressive of contempt," said the late lamented Svāmi Vivekānanda, "for the ugly features of the Dasyus or the Veddhas would apply to the great Tamilian race. In fact, if there be a toss for good looks between the Northerners and Southerners of India, no sensible man would dare prognosticate the result." †

Who, then, were the Dasyus? Are we in a position to identify them with any race or races that are alive to-day? Surely if Southern India was the primitive abode of the Dasyus, one should expect to meet with in some corner or other thereof, some race or remnants of a race who might be identified with the Dasyus of old. If such exist at all, their abode must be, not in any portion of the open and fertile sections of the country, but in the hills and solitudes to which they must necessarily have retired under the pressure of Āryan ‡ invasion. One finds this exactly to be the case. There are at present the remnants of some very ancient races

* *Vide* "Madras Journal of Literature and Science" for 1886-1889: article by Dr. Oppert entitled "The original inhabitants of Bharata Varsha"; please see the first paragraph.

† I found this remark quoted in an Indian Journal entitled "The Prabuhdda Bhārata."

‡ By "Āryan" is meant "the Vedic race" or the followers of Indra.

occupying the solitary dales, hills, and forests of Southern India, and leading a very precarious life, who, in their physical appearance, answer to the description of the enemies of the primitive Āryas, as given in some of the Vedie hymns, and they are the Kadir, the Paniyans, the Sholigas, the Kurubas, and the Iruḷar, who are all a very black, short-statured, snub-nosed people, which last feature is, apparently, what made the Vedic *Manavas* call them "the noseless ones." Any careful observer of the facial features of a genuine Veddha of Binnetenne would have noticed his unusually broad nose. It is not, therefore, unlikely that the Veddha race of Ceylon is racially identical with the ethnic group called 'Dasyus' or "the noseless ones" in the Vedas.

To sum up what has been said above, the Vedic race and the Aśuras or Dānavas of ancient India were but sections of the same race, the Aśuras were the senior branch of the Solar race, who were also the first or earliest legendary rulers of India, that the chief seat of the Aśura ascendancy in India was in the Southern regions, that the Aśuras and the Vedic race were a dark-complexioned people who traced their descent to Kāsipar and Takkan.

Can the above be alleged or affirmed of the ancestors of the Sanskrit-speaking races who are admitted, on all hands, to have entered India after it had been for centuries in the occupation of the Tamilians? I think not. In so far as the records of India are concerned, there does not seem to be any possibility of mounting beyond the Aśura or the Daitya races who form the deepest stratum to which the antiquarian could hope to penetrate in the history of ancient India, and these were a South Indian people who had their chief cities in the South.

There seems to be only one Indian race now to which most of these considerations readily apply, namely the Tamiḷ-speaking race, the representative of the Dravidian peoples of India. Their antiquity in India is conceded on all hands to be far greater than that of the Sanskrit-speaking

peoples. The traditions of India as preserved in Sanskrit literature itself associate their kings with events of remote antiquity. The Tamiḻs themselves have lost traditions if they had any *current among them* which indicate any locality outside India as their original land of birth. On the contrary, the few legends that linger among them point to the existence of a belief among the early Dravidians that their ancestors lived in a continent that lay to the south of the present Cape Comorin and was subsequently submerged under the sea, with all their ancestors.

What do the Sanskrit records say on this point? They declare that the Manu who was saved in the flood was a monarch of the Dravidas, named Satya Vrata, that he was a king of Malaya, or the Pāṇḍiyan kingdom, and that he was the great ancestor of the Āryas, who ordained that his descendants should offer sacrifices to the gods as he did on descending from the ark. Yama, the great monarch of the South, was one of the earliest kings of the Āryas in India. The purāṇic genealogy associates Yama with the first beginnings of the family of man after the deluge. For it represents him to be the son of the Sun (Vivasvat) and identifies him with the great Manu, the virtuous and faithful Vaivasuvatha or Satya Vrata of Malaya who survived the flood. This makes it perfectly clear that the primitive Indian believed that the Pāṇḍiyan country was the cradle of the human race after the flood and that the fountain-head of the Ārya race of India was in its extreme South.

The above is in entire accord with the traditions of the Pāṇḍiyan country. An old tradition that has been preserved to our day in some of the Tamiḻ classics locates the commencement of the civilisation of the Pāṇḍiyan country in the hoary past, far beyond the times when the Aśuras and the Devas of the Rig-Veda fought their fratricidal and sanguinary wars, on the plains of South India. According to this tradition, Southern India was the seat of powerful dynasty at a very remote time, and the capital of that

dynasty was the centre of a literary activity which continued throughout three successive periods separated from one another by two deluges, one universal, and the other partial. The tradition gives the number of the Pāṇḍiyans who held sway during these three periods to be 196, beginning with 'Kāisina-Vaḷudi' and ending with 'UgrapperuVaḷudi,' the respective number of the Pāṇḍiyans who ruled during the three periods being 89, 59, and 49.

It is not my purpose to discuss at length the credibility of the tradition, whether it can be accepted as containing facts of authentic history, or whether it can be believed in part or in whole. I may observe, however that traditions in general often contain or embody in a more or less distorted form facts of history which, by the aid of information derived from other allied sources, may often be gleaned and brought within the pale of authentic history. The main or the central facts of the tradition * now before us, on the truth or falsity of which its fate must necessarily depend, are, obviously, the following, *viz.*, that a large continent once existed in the Indian Ocean which was connected with or contiguous to South India and which was, in course of time, submerged by a huge deluge, that Southern India was the seat of human habitation from very remote times, and that the race which occupied it had an organised government of its own, and possessed extensive literature and that this race was identical with the ancestors of the present Tamiḷ-speaking peoples of South India.

The above would seem to represent, briefly, the essence of the whole tradition. That a deluge which swept away whole races of men occurred within the recollections of the

* The tradition is preserved in "Iraiyanār Akapporuḷ," a work attributed to Nakkīrar. I however think that Uruttirasanman, to whom the collection of "Akanānūru" is attributed, was also the author of the commentary on Iraiyyanar Akapporuḷ. The commentator Nachchar quotes it, who, according to the late Mr. Seshagiri Sāstriyār, flourished not later than the 11th century of our era.

primitive tribes, is a fact that no scholar will be disposed to deny. The Hebrew Scriptures have preserved a fairly distinct account of an appalling catastrophe of this kind. If the deluge of the Hebrew records and that mentioned in the traditions of the Dravidians refer to one and the same event, the historical character of the reference to a great flood made in the tradition receives full corroboration, and it has only to be pointed out that, whereas the Hebrew records do not give us any definite indications of the particular part of the surface of the globe which was the abode of the antediluvian man, the Dravidian tradition definitely locates the prediluvian abode of their ancestors if not of the whole human race, on a large continent which once stood above the waters of the Indian Ocean, and of which the present Southern India formed a part. The existence of a large continent in the Indian Ocean at a period not very remote from the present time has been surmised by such eminent scientists as Professors Hæckel, Topinard and Huxley.* These savants have held that this large continent of former times was the cradle of the human race, and that, within the recollection of man, Southern India did not form part of Asia. Not less interesting or significant is what Sir John Evans said in his Presidential Address † at the British Association some years ago, viz., that there were strong reasons for supposing that South India was the cradle of the human race. "Investigations in relation to race," says Dr. Macleane, "show it to be by no "means impossible that Southern India was once the passage "ground by which the ancient progenitors of Northern and "Mediterranean races proceeded to the parts of the globes "which they now inhabit. Human remains and traces "have been found on the East Coast of an age which is "indeterminate but quite beyond the ordinary calculations of "history. Antiquarian research is only now beginning to find

* *Vide* "The Anthropological Journal (Madras Government Museum), Vol. II, Bulletin No. 3, pp 134 and 197.

† See under "The Dravidian Problem."

"means of supplementing the deficiency caused by the "absence of materials constructed or collected by usual historical methods. These results are especially to be regretted "as, without doubt, the people who have for many ages "occupied this portion of the Peninsula are a great people "influencing the world, not much, perhaps, by moral and "intellectual attributes, but to a great extent by superior "physical qualities." *

The agreement between the Tamilian tradition concerning the existence in times past of a large continent in the Indian Ocean and the conclusions of modern science in that respect as voiced by some of the most eminent scientists of the century, is a circumstance that must needs arrest the attention of any honest mind, especially when viewed side by side with the fact that centuries before the sciences of Geology and Natural History were born, the records of South India had, in no uncertain voice, declared that once a continent stood in the Indian Ocean of which South India formed a part and that a watery catastrophe overwhelmed the races that occupied it.

The old theory of Drs. Caldwell and Max Muller and others of their school, that the ancestors of the Dravidians entered India through the North-West boundary and through Scind and were driven, subsequently, towards the South by the irruptions of the Sanskrit-speaking races, is now generally considered as not resting on sufficient evidence. Dr. Caldwell † himself would seem to have been fully conscious of the weakness of this supposition when he wrote that "there is no proof nor is there even a tradition among the Dravidians to indicate that they had ever occupied the North of India." Hence Dr. Fergusson, ‡ with a full understanding

* *Vide* "The Manual of Administration of the Madras Presidency" by Dr. Macleane, Vol. I., pp. 110 and 111.

† *Vide* his Comparative Grammar.

‡ *Vide* "Indian and East Architecture" by Dr. Fergusson, Introduction, pp. 11 and 29.

of the various aspects of the question, has expressed himself as follows, "Their (the Dravidians") settlement in India "extends to such pre-historic times that we cannot even "feel sure that we regard them as immigrants or, at least, "as either conquerors or colonists on a large scale, but rather "as aboriginal in the sense in which that term is usually "understood. The hypothesis, that would represent what "we know of their history most correctly, would place their "original seat in the extreme south, some-where probably "not far from Madura or Tanjore, and thence spreading "fan-like towards the North. They have no traditions "which point to any seat of their race out of India, or of "their having migrated from any country with whose "inhabitants they can claim any kindred. So far as they "know they are indigenous and aboriginal."

The above facts speak for themselves. They shut us up to the conclusion that the Aŝuras whom the classical traditions of India represent to have held the dominant place in times of remote antiquity among the races of India, and, indeed, of the three worlds as well, were identical with the primitive races of the Pāṇḍiyan kingdom. This is just what one might expect to arrive at, consistently * with the traditions in Sanskrit. For, as noticed elsewhere, if it was at Malaya † in the South that the ark of Manu rested when the waters of the flood began to abate, if the scene of Manu's encounter with the little fish is identified with a part of the Pāṇḍiyan country, if the penances of the progenitor Manu after the flood were carried on among the hills of Malaya, if the scenes of the Matsya Avatār of Vishṇu are expressly located in Madura, the capital of the Pāṇḍiyas, if the adoption

* *Vide* Mr. Taylor's Report on "The Historical Manuscripts," Vol. II, p. 787. See Dasāvatāra Charitram.

† The Matsya Purāṇam gives a part of Malaya or Malabar as the scene of Manu's encounter with the little fish, while in the Bhāgavatam the scene is laid in the south of India and Manu is represented in the character of Satya Vrata, King of Dravida.

by the Pāṇḍiyas of the "fish emblem" on their banners was traditionally attributed to the mythological connection between the Pāṇḍiyas and their great ancestor whom "the Divine Fish" saved from the deluge, if the Manu of the Vedas was identical with Satya Vrata Pāṇḍiyan, king of the Dravidas, if the Sanskrit records agree that the Āriyas were the offspring of this southern prince, it would indeed seem that our antiquarians have all this while been seeking for the truth where they can least hope to find it.

Before proceeding any further, however, with the nvestigation on hand, it appears essential to meet and answer a difficulty which must have by this time suggested itself, I dare say, to some, at least, of my readers. I mean. the difficulty of proving that the word "Āriya" is a pure Tamiḻ vocable and not a Sanskrit term naturalised in Tamiḻ as now generally supposed. The hypothesis of the identity of the primitive Āriyas and the primitive Dravidians requires that the name 'Āriya' should have likewise been a pure Dravidian term and not a Sanskrit word as now maintained by Northern Pundits. The author of the Tamiḻ lexicon "Divākaram" gives the following terms as synonyms for "the nobility" or "the upper classes," viz.:—

1. Sānrōr சான்றோர்.
2. Mikkōr மிக்கோர்.
3. Nallavar நல்லவர்.
4. Mēlavar மேலவர்.
5. Āyntōr ஆய்ந்தோர்.
6. Uyarntor உயர்ந்தோர்.
7. Āriyar ஆரியர்.
8. Ulaku உலகு.
9. Ānrōr ஆன்றோர்.
10. Arivuḍaiyōr அரிவுடையோர்.

Any scholar of the classical Tamiḻ will readily admit that, of the above ten words, the first six and the last two are beyond question words of indigenous origin. Of the remaining two words, viz., "Āriyar" and "Ulaku," the latter has, of late, been the subject of much discussion among Tamiḻ scholars, and one is not sure that its supposed alien origin can be satisfactorily established. But whatever the history of the word "Ulaku" may be, if it can be proved

that the word "Āriyar" is a pure Tamil̤ vocable, it is not too much to say that the modern theory concerning the racial affinities of the Āriyas of India must be an entirely faulty one, and, as such, will have to be taken on hand for serious revision. I will only ask your attention to the following table of Tamil̤ words derived from the four pure Tamil̤ roots 'Karu,' 'Paru,' 'Valu' and 'Aru'.

From "Karu," meaning "black" or "dark," we have—

1. Karumai (கருமை), blackness or darkness.
2. Karum (கரும்), black or dark.
3. Kari (கரி), anything black or dark,
4. Kariya (கரிய), black or dark.
5. Kariyan (கரியன்), a black person.
6. Kāriyon (காரியோன்) or Kāriyan (காரியன்), a black person
7. Kār (கார்), dark.
8. Kāri (காரி), black or a black person.
9. Kāriya (காரிய), black or dark.

From "Paru," meaning "great" or "large," we have (1) Paru-mai (பருமை), bigness or largeness. (2) Parum (பரும்), large or big. (3) Pari (பரி), large or big. (4) Pariya (பரிய), large or big. (5) Pariyan (பரியன்), a big or great person. (6) Pāriyon (பாரியோன்), or Pāriyan (பாரியன்), same as the above. (7) Pār (பார்), large or big. (8) Pāri (பாரி), same as the above. (9) Pāriya (பாரிய), same as the above.

From "Valu," meaning "strong," we have—(1) Valimai (வலிமை), strength. (2) Valum (வலும்), strong. (3) Vali (வலி), strength or strong. (4) Valiya (வலிய), strong. (5) Valiyan (வலியன்), a strong person. (6) Vāliyōn (வாலியோன்) or Vāliyan (வாலியன்), same as the above. (7) Vāli (வாலி), same as the above. (8) Vāliya (வாலிய), strong. (9) Vāl (வால்), strong.

From "Aru," meaning "noble" or "precious" we have—(1) Aru-mai (அருமை), preciousness or exaltedness. (2) Arum (அரும்), noble or high. (3) Ari (அரி), same as the above. (4) Ariya (அரிய), same as the above. (5) Ariyan (அரியன்), a noble

person. (6) Āriyan (ஆரியன்), same as the above. (7) Āriyon (ஆரியோன்), same as the above. (8) Ār (ஆர்), noble or precious. (9)Āri (ஆரி), a noble person, the Choḷa king. (10) Āriya (ஆரிய), noble or high.

A cursory glance at the above table must suffice to show how utterly untenable is the current notion that the Tamiḷ word "Āriyar" is a Sanskrit term adopted into Tamiḷ in later times. As has been shown above, it is as much a derivative from the Dravidian root "Aru" as the words 'Kāriyan,' 'Pāriyan' and 'Vāliyan,' whose indigenous origin has never been questioned, are admittedly such from the Dravidian roots 'Karu,' 'Paru' and Valu. "Ari" in the sense of the Choḷa king is usually, but I think, erroneously, held to be an equivalent of another name of the Choḷa, namely, "Ārthari," which means "the king who wears a garland of the flowers of the Atti tree." 'Āri' is simply a synonym of "Āriyan" which the Choḷa really was. The dynasty of Jaffna, which was an offshoot rather of the Choḷas than of the Pāṇḍiyas, made use of the name 'Āriyar' as their distinctive title. Besides this, "* Āriyan" is a synonym of "Sūrian," which is a name of the Choḷa king. The Tamiḷ classics and the latest results of South Indian archæological decipherments agree that the Choḷas belonged to the ancient solar race of classical India, and were, therefore, the kith and kin of the five Āriya tribes of the Vedic hymns. On these grounds, it is obvious that the accepted interpretation of the Choḷyan name Ari is based on an error, and that its correct signification is the same as that of 'Āriyan' assumed by the Choḷa rājāhs of Jaffna. It may be interesting here to draw attention to a remark which the author of the last chapters of the *Mahā Vansa* has been good enough to make in relating the history of the invasion of Ceylon by the Āriya Chakkravarties of Jaffna in the beginning of the thirteenth century, namely, that although the Chakkravarties called

* Seliya Sekara Sinka Āriyan was the first of the Chakkravarties of Jaffna (*vide* Yālpāṇa Vaipava Mālai).

themselves "Āriyas," they were, in reality, not "Āriyas", but "Dravidians." Thus it would appear that the idea now generally prevalent, namely, that the dignity of calling oneself an "Āriya" is the exclusive privilege of the Sanskritian races, was in vogue also at the time of the writer above quoted. In fact, there is enough evidence to show that, for some centuries past, the Sanskritian races of North India have claimed this name as one of their exclusive appellations, while they have stigmatised as "Anāriyar," *i, e.*, non-Āriyas all those races who were not of their extraction. On the other hand, it is not less significant that the word "Āriyar" in Tamiḻ means not only the noble and the great, but also a barbarain or "Milechcha". This is a curious instance of a word doing duty, not merely in different, but in quite opposite, senses. What is the explanation of this unique anomaly? It has already been shown that "Āriyar" is a Dravidian appellation, with which the upper classes of the primitive solar race of India were dignified. How happens it, then, that the Sanskritian has been claiming it as his own? To my mind there seems to be only one explanation or solution of the difficulty, and that is, that the use of the name "Āriyaṙ" originated among the races of North India only after their upper classes and their royal houses came in contact with the Dravidian Solar race in the South of India. That the Sanskrit in which the epics and the purāṇas are written shows evident marks of having been profoundly influenced in its formation and development by the Tamiḻian languages, has been admited by such great authorities as Drs. Oppert * and Caldwell.† As fusion of languages must necessarily imply a fusion of the races which spoke them, the striking affinities which the classical Sanskrit is held to bear to the classical Tamiḻ can be satisfactorily explained only by the assumption that the

* *Vide* his "The Primitive Inhabitants of Bharata Varsha".

† *Vide* his Comparative Grammar. He has maintained that the cerebral sounds which now exist in the Sanskrit were adopted from the Tamilian languages

modern races of Northern India are to a considerable extent the hybrid progeny of the primitive Dravidian and Sanskritian races of Northern Hindustan.

If the facts noticed in the foregoing pages have any value or afford us any help in the elucidation of the antiquities of India, they certainly lead us to no other conclusion but what we have endeavoured to establish in this paper, and that conclusion is that, if any remnant of the old solar race should exist in India, it would be found, not among the Northern races, but among the Dravidian population of the South. The existence of three distinct strata of races in Southern India, viz., the pre-Tamilic, the Tamilic, and the Sanskritic is a fact now generally admitted by antiquarian scholars.

The following classification * of the Hindu races adopted by some anthropologists would seem to represent the same view, viz.:

FIRST: *Pre-Tamilic*, now represented by the Santals, Kols, Bhils, Ghonds, Yanādis, Mandas, Varalis, Veddhas, etc.

SECOND: *Tamilic*, represented by the Tamils, the Telugus, the Canarese, the Malayālese, etc.

THIRD: The *Sanskritic*, now represented by all those races that speak Sanskritian dialects in the North of India.

All the solar and the lunar races of ancient India, with whose praises the Sanskrit books are full, belonged to the the second group, while the primitive Sanskritians † were identical with a race that came in contact with them many centuries before the Christian era, and in course of time adopted their literature and philosophy. For it is never pretended that the ancestors of the Sanskritian races ever possessed a literature which was prefectly independent of the solar race of Hindustan.

**Vide* "The Anthropological Journal," The Government Museum, Madras, Bulletin, No. 3, The Dravidian Problem.

† I have used the name "Sanskritian" instead of "Āryan" as the latter name is manifestly a misnomer in the case of the Northern arces except in so far as it implies the mixed origin of these races.

ODE TO CHERAMAN PERUM CHORRU UDIYAN CHERALATHAN.

(*No. 2 of Puṟa Nāṉūṟu*).

BY

K. G. SESHA IYER, Esq., B.A., B.L., *Trivandrum.*

The song of which an English rendering is given below is among the most ancient of the lyrics in the *Puṟa Nāṉūṟu, a collection of 400.* It is placed second in the collection, and is written in honour of the earliest Chēra sovereign known to Tāmiḷ literature, by a contemporary poet, Muḍi-Nāga-Rāyar of Muraṅgi-ūr. The Chēra therein celebrated was possessed of such boundless resources that he was able during the Mahābhārata war to feed the rival hosts throughout the campaign. Hence the name *Perum Chōṟṟu Udiyan*, "Great Rice-giver", by which he is handed down to posterity in Tamiḷ literature. Truly, charity has been the household divinity of the Chēra kings from remote antiquity. The unique distinction of feeding the contending forces at Hastināpur which this ancient Chera king is, in the accompanying song, said to have achieved, is also found attributed to him in another ancient work, the *Silappadikāram*, of which the author is another Chēra,—Ilan-ko-aḍigaḷ. It is obvious that the hero and the author of the *Puṟa Nāṉūṟu* lyric lived at the time of the Mahābhārata war, to which different dates from the middle of the 15th century B. C. to the middle of the 10th Century, B.C. have been assigned by Orientalists. A very recent writer, Mr. Velandai Gopāla Aiyar, concludes, as the result of an able and elaborate investigation into the question that the date of the great War is 1176 B. C. If this date be accepted, then nearly thirty-one centuries have rolled by since *Cheramān-Perum Chōṟṟu Udiyan Cheralāthan*, and his court-poet *Muḍi-Nāga-*

Rāyar, who sang the *Puṟa Nāṉūṟu* lyric in his praise lived. The Tamiḷ poem exhibits an aptness of language and a style, perfect for grace, terseness and suggestiveness that cannot possibly be reproduced in a translation. To appreciate them and to realize the excellence attained by Tamiḷ poetry even in that remote age, the reader should go to the original itself.

P. N. N. 2.

Hail noble king! whose nature well combines
The qualities of all the elements;
Whose long, forgiving suff'ring is a match
To mother earth's; whose judgment wise is wide
As all pervading ether, and whose might
Like air illimitable, and like fire
Resistless, with refreshful mercy still
Is tempered, which thy glorious sway upholds
As water cool enlivens Nature's face.
Hail warrior-king! Thy land with plenty smiles,
With untold wealth the deep sea's bosom yields,
And treasures new that ceaseless to thy ports
From foreign lands rich merchant-vessels bring
The sun that thy eastern sea is born
To thy foam-crested western ocean seeks
His rest at eve. Sky bounds thy land alone!
Majestic monarch! when the *ten times ten*
Kauravas, crowned with golden *tumpai* wreaths,
Wrathful in battle 'gainst the heroes *Five*—
Lords of the fiery steeds with tossing mane—
Their patrimony lusting after, fought,
Thou didst unstinted savoury food supply
To either host, till all the *Kurus* fell.
Illustrious king! though luscious milk may sour,
The sun his brilliance lose, and e'en the four
Vedas themselves their holy teachings change,
Mayst thou by ministers be served, whose love
For thee and wisdom in thy councils shall

Constant through all vicissitudes remain!
Mayst thou in power and glory steadfast shine
Throughout all time like Pothiya's sacred mount
And golden-peaked Himālaya where rest
The dainty-headed fawn and large-eyed deer
Securely by the holy triple fire
Which for their ev'ning rites the sages raise!

NOTES

ON THE RELATION OF THE PANDAVAS TO THE TAMILIAN KINGS.

The Puranānūru lyric before us is a piece of historical importance bringing, as it does, to the front certain remarkable data in the investigation of the early history of the Bharata-land, namely, the relation of the conquerors of Kurukshatra to the royal families of Southern India.

The popular belief that the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas were cousins is getting abandoned and the early stories of their birth and boyhood discredited by scholars. The oldest portion and the original story of the Mahā-bhārata was only the narration of the "great war". The present bulky and voluminous character of the epic is the natural and gradual outgrowth of later generations.

It was once surmised by Western Scholars that the Pāṇḍu-brothers were from *Uttara* (Northern) *Kuru*, which was supposed by them to have existed somewhere in the neigbourhood of Tibet; and which is identified by Mr. R. C. Dutt with Kashmir. But information gathered from local traditions, and inferences gleaned from ancient literatures bring to light that the Pāṇḍavas were natives of the South and that their residence, before they invaded and colonised

the *Indraprasta* in the north, was in *Dravida*. *Kāṇḍava-prasta* was converted into *Indra-prasta* and named accordingly in honoric remembrance of the great and first heroic act of Arjuna, the son of Indra.

The fraternity of the Five was not of birth but due to the tie of their united co-operation for the common cause; and it is a proof against their consanguinity that each so-called brother was known by his own ancestral or dynastic name. Yudhishtira, the first member of the brotherhood is called, *Aṟan-magan* (அறன் மகன்) in the oldest records of Southern India. An ode addressed to him by Gautama is yet preserved in the collections of *Puṟa-nânûṟu*, though some fragments of the lyric have unhappily been lost.* There Gautama addresses Yudhishtira *Aṟavōn-magan* "son of Yama"; *Dharma-putra* is the Sanskrit equivalent and the name Yama and Dharma are synonymous.

The region of Yama was in the southernmost portion of the peninsula and it is still known as such among the masses. And Yama was the lord of the South and the founder of the oldest Tamilian dynasty and his lineage was subsequently known as *Pāṇḍiya* or *Pāṇḍava* from *paṇḍu* (Tamil), "old." They are also called *Paḻaiyar* which means 'the old kings'. One of the epithets of Yama is Aṟan (அறன்) "the just", hence his descendants, the Pāṇḍiyas, claimed the name Aṟavōr (அறவோர்), "the just". Both Aṟan and Aṟavōr are derivatives of Aṟam (அறம்) "justice", or "virtue". The assertion that the denominations Pāṇḍiya and Pāṇḍava are synonymous may be studied from the following. In the Mahavansa of the Ceylon the King of Madura who gave his daughter in marriage to Vijaya, the founder of the Singalese dynasty, is called 'the King *Pāṇḍava* of Southern Madura'. And the son of Vijaya was named, after his grand-father, *Pāṇḍava-vamsa-Deva*. From this it is not difficult to conclude that the *Pāṇḍiya* of Tamil literature and *Pāṇḍava* of Sanskrit are one and the same

* Vide, *Puṟam* lyric 366.

and Yudhishtira, the son of Yama or Dharma belonged to the Royal family of Pāṇḍiyas of the South.

Who was Arjuna and to what family did he belong? Arjuna is titled as the son of Indra. Now Indra was the lord of the East, and inferences from *Stala-Purāṇas* point out that the region of Indra comprised the districts between and about the *Krishṇa* and the *Godavary*. Dr. Maclean has also, in his Manual of the Administration of the Madras Presidency, located the Kingdom of Indra in the very region above specified. The famous capital of Indra is identified with the old city of Amarāvati at the mouth of the Krishṇa river. It was the great sea-port town of the Indra dynasty. Besides, the *Mahêndra*, "the Great Indra range", which runs through the basins of the two rivers and the city of *Rāja Mahendra*, "the city of the Great King Indra", situated in the district, still bear impress on their very names of the reign of the Indras. Moreover, we read in the Mahā bhārata that *Janamējaya*, the Great-Grand-son of Arjuua and the crowned Emperor of the Kurukshetra, came down from his capital *Hastināpuri* to the junction of the river *Haritha* with the *Thungabhadra* to perform his great sacrifice the "Nāga-Yāga". Why such a tedious journey? May it not be that he had something to do in commemoration of the native land of his fore-fathers? Thus we see clearly that the region of the Indras was located in the South, and not in any place in Northern India, and that Arjuna belonged to the Royal house of the Indra dynasty. He had matrimonial connection with the Royal families of Pāṇḍiyan of Madura and of Nāga King of Manalore somewhere near the river Thungabhadra *.

Yudhishtira, the Pāṇḍava, and Arjuna of the Indra dynasty became acquainted with each other and made alli-

*Kulothuṅga Choḷan says in one of his inscriptions that he defeated Vikkan (Vikramāditya) and chased him from Nangili in Kolar District by way of *Manalore* to Thungabhadra. From this we learn that the ancient Manalore was situated in those parts.

ance. Their ambition for conquests and thirst for victories cemented their friendship. They had heard the valour of the strong built and fearless Bhîma who was moving about the hilly tracts of Mysore and his victories over Bahan, the greatest Asura of the day, who resided in the neighbourhood of the Nilgris and was terrifying the people around him. They felt the importance of having a friendship with such a giant and met Bhīma in the neighbourhood of the Nilgris and included him in their alliance. Bhîma belonged to the Vāyu dynasty to which the ancient Hanuman son of Kesari, also belonged. The region of Vāyu is said to have comprised the hilly provinces of Mysore and Nilgris and his descendants had gained a world-known fame by their bravery and traditional valour.

Yudhishtira was a man of commanding personage, and possessed a calm intelligence, coupled with breadth of mind and loftiness of principles. Bhîma possessed extreme muscular strength and a fearless and stubborn nature, and was proficient in the use of the club. Arjuna had a keen and quick understanding, possessed a lovely and brave character, and was one of the greatest archers of the day. These three were joined by the twin-brothers, Nakula and Sahādeva, who were of equal nobility and daring. Of these, the former was distinguished as a horse-man and was skilful in the art of breaking in horses. Sahadeva, being a perfect man of letters, had many admirers around him. He was specially proficient in astronomy and had mastered all the knowledge of the day.

It is probable that the last two belonged to the lineage of the Chêra Kings and lived in that portion of Malabar bordering on the Nilgiris. This can be conjectured from the great interest which the king *Chêramān, Udiyan Cheralādan*, evinced in the "Great War". He partook in the warfare, helped the Pāṇḍavas and fed their armies in the camp during the war, which of course must have been a pre-arranged plan. The Chêramân's charity was so boundless that he fed not

only the army of his alliance but also that of their enemies impartially as is eulogised by the royal poet *Muḍi-Nāgarāyar* in the lyric above mentioned. Besides, according to tradition the twin-brothers were the sons of Deva-physicians. There can be little doubt that "Deva" is a Sanskrit translation of the Tamil name *Vānavar*, one of the titles by which the ancient *Chêras* were known. The mother of the twin-brothers, whoever she may have been, belonged to the royal family of the Chêras and had married two of the royal physicians of the Chêra house.

These five heroes formed themselves into a brotherhood and thenceforward lived together. And the brotherhood was virtually known by the name of the first and eldest member of the Society. They were accordingly called the *Pāṇḍavas*, and were also known as the *Pañjavas*, "the five". They lived for a considerable period in the neighbourhood of the Nilgiris, until they felt themselves strong enough to achieve their long cherished end; and there are many stories and very many traditions around the hill tracts of the Nilgiris about the movements of the Pāṇḍu-brothers in those parts. The Fort of *Bahan*, the Asura, and the rock where he was killed by Bhīma are still remembered by the people around. The cave where the Pāṇḍavas dined, slept and lived is a place of pilgrimage to this day. The Todas of the Nilgiris say that they are the descendants of *Kaḍōrkasa*, son of Bhīma by *Iḍumbi* who was a lady of great fortune and the owner of a fertile forest, and who fell in love with Bhīma and took him for husband, this union causing the death of *Iḍumban*, the brother of the maiden. According to the existing Epic, Sahādeva travelled from Indraprasta as far south as Mysore and his native land and sent from there Kaḍorkasa to Ceylon to procure valuable articles for the coronation ceremony of the great Yudhishtira at Indraprasta, the capital of their newly established kingdom.

We are likewise without any reliable information about Kunti-devi and as to which of these she was the mother of.

However, no sooner is the fraternity founded than we find the gracious lady there. The legend says that Bhîma took the other members of the brotherhood to the forest of Iḍumbi. This clearly shows that Bhîma was the prominent factor at the time of the formation of the brotherhood and one to whom the others were attracted. And Kunti is there to receive them with the proverbial Dravidian hospitalily. Besides we hear Kunti devi relating an incident in the childhood of Bhîma to the Brahmin lady of *Munnūṟṟu-Mangalam*, "a hamlet of 300 families," or, *Vetrakîyam*, "a place of bamboos", on the banks of *Ponnani* running westward from the Nilgiris. But she never alludes to the early history of the other four. So she must have been either unacquainted with the early history of the others or she must have had no occasion to relate it. These and other such incidents gathered from legends and stories make us infer that Kunti was the mother of Bhîma and the foster mother of the others. The kind patronage and the tenderness of Kunti was the knitting bond of the five. Besides the benevolence and the fortunes of Iḍumbi were so boundless as to make any want unfelt by the *Pañjavas* in their forest life.

The northern literature of the time ignores anything like the forest life, the birth, or the origin of these Pañjavas. Their prowess was felt at the time of the great war when they secured reputation and the admiration of nations. The Epic of the Mahābhārata was composed in honor of their victory in the war. It was purely a narrative poem. As Mr. Dutt says, "every later poet and editor has contributed his mite towards enlarging, altering, and distorting the ancient Epic ; every new sect has been careful to incorporate its new-fangled tenets in this national work ; and Krishṇa-worship, which is of later origin, has been bodily transplanted in the ancient narrative of the Kuru-Pāñchāla war." (Page 130, Ancient India.)

In the same place Mr. Dutt remarks, " the heroes of the existing Epic are the five sons of Pāṇḍu called Pāṇḍavas

who are entirely unknown to ancient Sanskrit literature. In the Buddhist work, Lalita Vistāra, the Pāṇḍavas are described as a wild mountain tribe; but, if so, how do they come to be enrolled as heroes in a war among the Āryan nation? We will not try to conjecture an answer." As has been pointed out in the foregoing pages, the Pāṇḍavas were not the sons of the same father, nor were they brothers by birth. With regard to the second part of the question it is clear from what we have said who the mountaineers of the Buddhist work, "Lalita Vistāra," were. Further the war was not one "among Āryan nations" but an invasion of the Dravidians into Northern India. The Tamilians of those early days were an ambitious and active people. The race was known in antiquity as Bharatas and they were likewise agriculturists, maritime traders, and warriors. They were accustomed to sea-voyages* and conducted trade with all the civililzed nations of the world then known. And they went forth by land to seek their fortunes, and founded kingdoms of their own in several directions in and out of the Bharata-Kaṇḍam which owes its name to the Tamilian race. Manu calls them Kshatriyas because of their military character.

Before the 'Great War,' we find another adventurous Dravidian† tribe occupying the tract of country near modern Kanouj. Their capital was Kampilya famous for its silk manufacture and looked upon as a centre of civilization by the surrounding kingdoms. Their conntry was known to the subsequent generations as Pāñchāla. There is no mention of the Pāñchālas in the Rig-Veda. The Satapāta-brahmana says that the Pāñchālas were called *Krivis* in ancient days. Prof. Zimmer supposes that the *Krivis* came from the North hills. There is no reliable evidence for this asser-

*See pp. 22 to 27.

† By the Dravidians we mean the Tamilians to the south of the Narbhada. To denote the whole race, we use the word 'Tamilian' or Bharatam.

tion; however, it seems to have been based on the antiquated theory of the northern origin of the Tamiḷians and of the Āriyans. But the oirginal home of the Tamiḷians was not Central Asia but Western Asia as shown in the article on "the Bharata land" (pp. 1 to 9). From the identification, in the Satapāta-brahmana, of the Pāñchālas with the Krivis we have to assume that the term *Krivi* is no other than an abbreviated form of the Tamiḷian word *Karuvar*, "people of the black soil," belonging to the Karu-nāḍu [from Kar (u) black, nāḍ (u) country], by which designation the plateau of the Southern Dekkhan is ever known. Kannaḍa or Canera is a corrupted form of the above word. Sanskrit literature reproduces the name as Karnāṭaka. Moreover, the customs and manners of the Pāñchālas apparently show that they belonged to the Dravidian or southern sect of the Tamiḷian race. Pāñchāli, the daughter of Durupata, married five husbands. This was a fact, not a myth, nor an act of sacrifice on the part of the civilized Durupata "to save his empire or his head."

The dame of the ancient *Tamiḷagam* (Home of the Tamiḷs) had the right to select her husband at her own choice. She was the mistress of the house and the heir to and owner of all property. *Tamiḷagam* was known in ancient literature as *Kumari-nāḍu*, "the land of the maiden," and among other nations as the "Land of Queens." We read in Egyptian annals that Hatasu, a Queen of Egypt, was the first to enter into commercial relations with "*Punt*" which was ruled by Queens. This *Punt* is further spoken of as the "Holy Land" from which the Egyptians received their *Ammon* worship. The description given of that land makes mention of "cocoanut palms overshadowing the huts." *Punt* has been generally identified with Southern Arabia. But among the articles or products of the land mentioned in the inscription of Hatasu, there are several which Arabia could not possibly have furnished.* The land of the cocoanut palm is evidently the southern portion of India from which a

* *Vide* "Egypt" by Mr. G. Rawlinson, pp. 181-2.

brisk trade was carried on in olden days to Egypt, Babylon, Arabia and Asia Minor. *Punt* cannot, therefore, be Arabia or any tract in Africa, but only South India. Megasthenes, in his account of India, says: "Next come the *Pandæ* the only race in India ruled by women. They say that *Hercules* having but one daughter, who was on that account all the more beloved, endowed her with a noble kingdom".*

The Purāṇas relate that Manu, "the Lord of the Dravidas," divided the country into two halves giving the southern portion to his *son Yama* and the northern where his capital was situated to his beloved daughter Ela:† To this day, the southern land now submerged under the sea is known to the masses as the dominion of *Yama*, the Lord of the south. The land of Ela was *Kumarinādu*, 'the land of the maiden'. For centuries it was ruled and presided over by Queens. Even today, in Malabar a portion of the ancient Tamiḻagam, the Queen is the owner of the kingdom and her brother who governs the people is her representative; the succession descends in the female line; and women in Malabar are heiresses and owners of property and are treated with greater regard and consideration than men.

The Tamilian system of marriage was *Svayamvaram*, by which the dames selected their husbands. Women had the liberty of marrying several husbands; but she could have only one husband at a time. Marriage was a cantract of

---

* *Vide* Dutt's "Ancient India," p. 255. It is regrettable that, owing to utter want of information regarding Southern India, so great a historian as R. C. Dutt has not been able to claim the valuable evidence furnished by Megasthenes to any part of India.

† *Ela* is also found written in Sanskrit as *Eḍa.* It is well known the Tamilian peculiar sound ḻ (ழ) changes into *l* or *ḍ* or *r* in Ariyan tongues. Cf. paḻam (பழம்), "fruit," *Palam* (Sans.); *pilai* (பிழை), "misery," *pīḍa* (Sans.); *ilu* (இழு). "draw," eru-o(Lat); etc. So the word *Ela* and *Eḍa* of the Sanskrit literature correspond to *Ilai* (இழை,) a Tamilian metaphoric appellation generally applied to the fair sex as in *Ner-ilai* (நேரிழை) and *Sey-ilai* (சேயிழை) "lady decked with jewels."

union between woman and man for a life time or a part of it; so that when the period of contract was over, she could marry another husband. Bhîma lived with Iḍumbi until she bore him a son when she took leave of him. Arjuna married the heiresses of the Nāga and Pāṇḍiya kingdoms one after the other staying with them until they became mothers. The same was the case with Santhanu and his first wife. The Purāṇas are full of such instances taken from the annals of reigning families more or less Tamiḻian.

The system of marriage was, however, not polyandry. Polyandry has assumed a meaning totally inapplicable to the ancient Tamiḻian custom, namely, the possession of many husbands at the same time. The Tamiḻian women always lived with single husbands. Dr. Oppert, when speaking of the Kunnavas of the *Paḻani hills*, Madura, in his excellent work, 'the Original Inhabitants of India,' (p. 214), says "Polyandry, it is true, does not actually prevail among the Southern Kunnavas, but a woman can take in succession as many husbands as she likes, though she is allowed only one at a time." It was the old Dravidian custom. Many of the South Indian castes are still strictly adhered to this ancient social habit. Though the Dravidian Pāñjāli took five husbands yet she never had more than one husband at a time. As the Mahā-bhārata says each member of the brotherhood lived with her for a fixed term, when the others regarded her as a sister or mother. The system fully justifies the popular saying' 'ஐவர்க்குந்தேவி, அழியாப்பத்தினி" "though wife to five yet the seat of chastity." Chastity was ever the home deity of the ancient Tamiḻ dames. It is seen, therefore, that polyandry as applied to the Tamiḻan system of marriage is incorrect and conveys a wrong meaning; and for the purpose of accuracy the term *Henandry* seems best suited, as Prof, Max Muller once proposed the term *Henotheism* to the Vedic Religion.

To resume the thread of our discourse, Pāṇḍavas, the mountaineers of the Lalita Vistāra, living in the neighbour-

8

hood of the Nilgiris, had an occasion to turn their attention to the north. The heralds from the country of Drupata came to Dravidam to announce the *svayamvaram* of Pāñjāli. As the proposal of Pāñjāli was to take in for her husband the most skilled archer of the day, the five brothers decided upon attending the *svayamvaram*; they had a full confidence in their superior skill in archery. Accordingly they went to Pāñjālam and Arjuna won the bride for them; Pāñjāli was then married to the five brothers according to the agreement drawn by Vyāsa. The daughter of Drupata thus became the wife of the Pañjavas. This was not in obedience, as the story says, to their mother, but in accordance to the then social custom; because the Dravidian custom sanctioned it. This is one of the strong proofs of the Pāṇḍavas belonging to the South Indian nations; for such a social custom was ever not known among Āryan nations.

We learn from the existing records that there had been a dispute between the Kurus and the Pāñchālas about the possession of Kāṇḍavaprasta, dating from the time of Kuru, the founder of the Kaurava dynasty at Hastiṇapuri. The greater part of this Kāṇḍavaprasta was gradually deserted by its people as a result of incessant disputes and quarrels between these two mighty kingdoms. It was under the protection of the Nāga kings, feudatory of the Pāñchālas or the Kurus—the more powerful of the time being the liege. Finally Droṇa, the Commander-in-chief of the Kauravas, took the country from the hands of Drupata. Now Pāñchāla became powerful consequent upon the new alliance with the Pāṇḍavas, who took the Kāṇḍavaprasta, by force, reconstructed its capital as Indraprasta, and colonised the country and established their rule over it. The coronation of Pāṇḍava, the first member of the brotherhood, was duly celebrated and, among the kings invited for the occasion, Kṛishṇa, a statesman and warrior, and who newly established a kingdom at Guzaret, is given a prominent place. A new alliance was then made by the Pāṇḍavas with this Kṛishṇa,

who belonged undoubtedly to the Tamiḻian race. The affinity of Kṛishṇa to the Tamiḻian race will come to light once more.

The domineering spirit and overweening pride of the Pāṇḍavas, the prominence and elevation of Kṛishṇa, the influence of the strong Pānchāla, and the united efforts of these three influential and growing powers in his neighbourhood and above all the arrogance of Pāñchāli roused the anger and jealousy of the strong-minded and self-respecting Suyoddhana, who then held the paramount power of Kurukshetra against the ambitious and active Pāṇḍavas. Then and there rises a rupture which comes to a crisis with the "Great War" and there the story of the Mahābhārata ends.

As far as it is in the recollection of man, the Bharata-war was the first invasion of the Southerners over the northern India, excepting of the earlier settlements of the adventurous Dravidian tribes, the Pāñchālas and the Yādhavas, at Campilya and Guzaret respectively. We can positively say that the members of the "brotherhood" represent the four great Tamiḻian sections of the Dravida; viz: Yudhistira the Pāṇḍava, the Tamiḻs, Bhīma the Kanarese, Arjuna the Telugus and the Twin-brothers, the Malabarians. Immediately after the "Great War," Parikshit, the Tamiḻian Monarch who was descended from Arjuna and Subadra, the Yadhava Lady, is crowned Emperor of the Kurukshetra and virtually becomes the paramount ruler of Hindustan. A thousand years after, about the beginning of our era, we find the Āndhras, a sect of the Tamiḻians, ruling in Magadha. They were then the supreme power in northern India and "held distant kingdoms under obedience if not under subjection." And thirdly, a thousand years later, the Choḻas became very powerful in the South, and Kulothuṅga, their King at Uraiyur conquered the kingdoms of the Āndhras or the Kaliṅgas, and his conquest of Bengal and Burma well deserves the attention of modern students of

History.* These historical facts bring to the front the warlike and adventurous character of the ancient Tamiḻians.

That the Tamiḻians were a martial race and had a glorious past may be studied from the ancient literature of the land. I may be permitted here to conclude this cursory note with the remarks of Mr. J. M. Nallasāmi Piḷḷai. The learned writer, in *the Siddhānta Dīpika* (October 1906), a scholarly magazine published at Madras, says: "The "Puṟanānūṟu and Aganānūṟu are full of incidents of sub- "lime heroism. The men delighted in the number of wounds "they received in the front part of their body as do the "German students now. The conquests made by the Tamiḻ "ḳings were far and wide. We have forgotten all this past "now. We take delight in recounting the deeds of other "nations. The ancient Tamiḻ martial race are now employed "in carrying on the most menial offices. Our ancient swords "have been literally beaten into spindles and ploughshares." I may add here that the two chapters in the *Sacred Kuṟaḷ*, 77 and 78 Viz: "The Excellence of an army," and "Military spirit" are evidence to the above statements. Heroism was displayed even by Tamiḻ dames; men imbibed valour from their mothers. The following stanzas, as quoted in the above mentioned magazine, from the Puṟa-nānūṟu, will represent a lively picture of the heroism of the ancient Tamiḻ women.†

Stanza 278.

நரம்பெழுந் துலறிய நிரம்பா மென்றோள்
முளரிமருங்கின் முதியோள் சிறுவன்
படையழிந்துமாறின னென்றுபலர்கூற
மண்டமர்க்குடைந்தன னாயி னுண்டவென்
முலையறுத்திடுவென் யானெனச்சினைஇக்
கொண்டவாளொடு படுபிணம்பெயராச்

---

*See the learned article on "The conquest of Bengal and Burma by the late lamented Kanagasabbai Pillai. B.A., B.L., published in the *Madras Review* for August 1902.

† *The Siddhānta Dipika*, Vol, VII. No. 7, pp. 244, 245.

செங்களந்துளவுவோள் சிதைந்துவேறாகிய
படுமகன் கிடக்கை காணூஉ
ஈன்ற ஞான்றினும் பெரிதுவந்தனளே.

"She was very old, her veins stood out and bones " protruded. She heard many people say that her son had " turned from the battle-field and fled. She vowed that it " be true that her son was afraid of battle, she would cut off " the breast that suckled him. With fury in her face and " sword in hand, she turned over the dead bodies in the red " field and searched and she came across the dead body of " her son cut in two. At sight of her dead son, she rejoiced " more than on the day she gave him birth to."

Stanza 278.

கெடுக சிந்தை கடிதிவள் துணிவே
மூதின் மகளி ராதல் தகுமே
மேனா ளுற்ற செருவிற் கிவடன்னை
யானை யெறிந்து களத் தொழிந்தனனே
நெருந லுற்ற செருவிற்கிவள் கொழுநன்
பெருநிரை விலங்கி யாண்டுப் பட்டனனே
இன்றும், செருப்பறை கேட்டு விருப்புற்று மயங்கி
வேல் கைக்கொடுதது வெளிது விரித்துடீஇப்
பாறு மயிர்க்குடுமி யெண்ணெய் நீவி
ஒருமக னல்ல தில்லோள்
செருமுக நோக்கிச் செல்கென விடுமே.

"Our heart ceases at this dame's great courage.
" Well may she merit her ancient age.
" In a former war, her father it was
" Who, killed by an elephant, died in the field.
" It was in the other day's battle, her husband
" Fell overpowered by numerous hosts:
" And now to-day at the beat of drum,
" Delighted and yet how sad was she this woman with an only son.
" She lovingly oiled and combed his hair,
" Gave him his spear and bade him seek the battle field!"

II.

ON THE WORDS "CHERA" AND "KERALA."

The present Malabar, a portion of the ancient "Tamiḻagam" was called by the ancients the Cheranāḍu, a corruption the old classical word *Chêraḷā-nāḍu*, and which is found in Sanskrit as Kēraḷa. There was much discussion about the origion and meaning of these two words. It was once argued by a recent writer, in the "Malabar Quarterly,"* an able journal, published at Ernakulam (Cochin State), that the two names Kēraḷa and Chēra are not etymologycally one but were of different origin, that both the words are not of a Dravidian origin but of a Sanskrit: Kēraḷa being derived from Nāḷi-Kēram "Co-coanut", and Chēra from Sekhara, "Crown", and that Kēraḷa was more ancient than Chēra for the former is found in the early literature of Sanskrit.

The above arguments are one sided and based on the authorities of the literature and the inscriptions of the North. Recent writers are greatly mistaken when they deal with questions historically connected with the South India. It is true that Sanskrit has a vast literature of its own and that much of the history and learning of Hindustan may be disclosed by a study of that literature. But it should be borne in mind that Tamiḻ is a more ancient and the literary language so far at least as Southern India is concerned. The history of Southern India cannot be perfect unless the vast treasures of Tamiḻ literature are laid under contribution. It is to be regretted that scholars are sadly wanting in this respect. We may be permitted to record our opinion here that regarding the history of the people, language and

---

* Now the *Monthly Review.*

religion of ancient India in general, the antiquarians and the historians should have as well consulted the literature of the South which are no less ancient and vast than that of the North.

Among the existing ancient Tamiḻ literatures, Puṟa-nānūṟu is, as already spoken of, one of the eight collective works of the Madura academy and is of a purely historical character. It gives us detailed information of more than twenty Chēra kings, most of whom have assumed either the title of *Cheral-ādan* or that of *Chêral-irum-Poṟai.* In these compound words *Chêral* denotes the country, while *ādan* or *irum-poṟai* is a titular name. *Chêral*, from the root *Chêr* (Tamiḻ), "join," and the formative *al*, means "the range." The derivatives *Chêralan*, "the owner of *Chêral*," and *Chêralam*, "the region of *Cheralan*," proceed from the above word *Chêral*, "the mountain range." This most ancient classical name Chêralam for Malabar had first found its way into the Sanskrit literature, through the edict of Aśoka, and hence is known there as Kēraḷa. In the *Kapur Di Giri* version of Aṣoka's edict, in the third centuary B. C., the king of the *Chêraḷam* is called *Keraḷa-putra.*

There is little doubt that the northerners have learnt the name of the country from the people on the border—the Canarese. It is a well known fact that in Canarese the initial palatals of Tamiḻ words change, as a rule into gutterals, *e.g.*,

Cheydān (Tamiḻ), "He did," Gēyidanu (Canarese)
Chevi (do), "ear," Kivi or Kimi (Canarese)
Chenni (do), "head," Kenne (Canarese.)

There are many instances as these; and the same phonetic process was met by the Tamiḻ word *Chēraḷam* in Kanarese and is naturally pronounced *Keraḷam.* Thus we can have no hesitation in saying that Chēra is a contraction of Chera-lam and that Chērala and Kēraḷa are etymologically and historically the same and that Kēraḷa is of more recent origin than *Chērala*, the South Indian classical word, as the latter is recorded in the second lyric of Puṟa-nānūṟu-Ode to

Cheramān, the date of which is simultanious with the "Great War".

The various explanations given by Northern Pandits clearly, though misleadingly, to Keraḷa are all fanciful. Kēraḷa from *nāḷi-Keram* (Sanskrit,) "Cocoanut," or from *Kē-ralati*, (Sanskrit), "floating in waters," is very tempting: but the word is radically from another-source and not of Sanskrit origin as we have explained above. It is still more fanciful to derive Chera or Chērala from the Sanskrit Sēkhra- "crown." "It might perhaps be advisable," says Dr. G. Oppert, "to discontinue deriving the name of Indian localities from Sanskrit words, as has been usually done hitherto, unless where such derivations are well supported." ("The Original Inhabitants of India", p. 42.)

The Tamilian Antiquary.

VOL. 1.

No. 1

i. The Bharata Land or Dravidian India.
By Paṇḍit D. Savariroyn, M.R.A.S.

ii. The Solar and the Lunar Races of India.
By V. J. Tambi Piḷḷai Esq., M.R.A.S.

iii. Ode to Chēramān-Udhiyan Chēralādan.
By K. G. Sesha Aiyar Esq., B.A., B.L.

iv. Notes: (1) The Relation of the Pāṇḍavas with the Tamilian Kings; and (2) the Etymology of the word Chēra and Kērala.
By Paṇḍit D. Savariroyan, M.R.A.S.

No. 2.

A Critical Review of the Story of the Rāmāyaṇa and an Account of South Indian Castes (in Tamiḻ).
By V. P. Subramaniya Mudaliyār Esq., G.B.V.C.

With an Introduction (in English).
By J. M. Nallaswami Piḷḷai Esq., B.A., B.L.

No, 3.

Some Mile-Stones in the History of Tamiḻ Literature, or, The Age of Jñāna Sambandha.
By the late Prof. P. Sundaram Piḷḷai, M.A.

With an Introduction *By Rai Bahadur V. Venkayya Avl.*, M.A.

No. 4.

An Inquiry into the date of Manikkavacagar:

i. Māṇikkavāçagar and His Date.
By K. G. Sesha Aiyar Esq., B.A., B.L., M.R.A.S.

ii. Māṇikkavāçagar and the Early Christians of Malabar.
By T. Ponnambalam Piḷḷai Esq, M.R.A.S.

No. 5.

i. Glimpses of Ancient Dravidians.
By E. S. W. Senathi Rāja Esq., LL.B., M.R.A.S.

ii. The Augustan Age of Tamiḻ Literature.
By S. Krishṇaswāmi Aiyangār Esq., M.A., M.R.A.S.

iii. The Ten Tamiḻ Idylls.
By the late Prof. P. Sundaram Piḷḷai, M.A.

[*Each of these first five numbers is priced As. 8 only*].

No. 6.

Pura-poruḷ (1) A summarised account of *Puṟa-poruḷ*; and (2) Selections translated from *Puṟa-nānūṟu.*,

By the late Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A., D.D.

With an Introduction, *By J. M. Nallaswāmi Piḷḷai Esq.*, B.A., B.L.

No. 7.

Valmiki Ramayana and South Indian Sociology.

(A collection of seven learned essays on the subject).

No. 8.

i. Dravidian Kingdoms.

By Dewan Bahadur T. Desikāchariar, B.A., B.L.

ii. The Conquest of Bengal and Burma by the Tamils.

By the late Mr. V. Kanakasabhi Piḷḷai B.A., B.L.

iii. Distribution of Races round the Persian Gulf.

By J. A. Saldana Esq., B.A. LL.B.

iv. Representative Institutions in Southern India.

By T. Ponnambalam Piḷḷai Esq., M.R.A.S.

v. Laments.—Selections from Pura-nānūru.

By K. G. Šesha Aiyar Esq., B.A., B.L.

vi. Serpent Worship in India. *By M. Jīvaratnam Esq.*, B.A.

vii. The Ancient Dravidian Industries and Commerce.

By the Paṇḍit M. Rāghava Aiyangar Avl.

No. 9.

i. Dravidian Kingdoms and List of Pāṇdiyan Coins.

By Dewan Bahadur T. Desikāchāriar, B.A., B.L.

ii. Music in Ancient India.

By C. Tirumalayya Naidu Esq., M.R.A.S.

iii. The Origin of the Cranganur (Koḍuṅgōḷūr) Temple.

By T. Ponnambalam Piḷḷai Esq., M.R.A.S.

iv. The Age of Pattupāṭṭu.

By T. A. Rāmalingam Cheṭṭiār Esq., B.A., B.L

v. Heroic Mothers of Ancient Tamiḻagam.

By Paṇḍit M. Rāghava Aiyangar A

No. 10.

i. The Origin of the Tamiḻ Veḷḷāḷas.

By V. J. Tambi Piḷḷai, Esq., M.R.A.S.

ii. The Poets of the Tamiḻ Lands.

By the late Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A., D.D.

[*Each of these Second five numbers is priced As. 12 only*].